DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 345 743 IR 054 046

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Gillespie, Pamela, Ed.; Vaughn, Susan, Ed. |
| TITLE | Collection Development: Survival Tactics in an Age of Less. Selected Proceedings of the 1991 LACUNY Institute (New York, New York, April 12, 1991). LACUNY Occasional Paper No. 7. |
| INSTITUTION | City Univ. of New York, N.Y. Library Association. |
| PUB DATE | 92 |
| NOTE | 71p. |
| AVAILABLE FROM | Library Association of the City University of New York, c/o Pamela Gillespie, Hunter College Library, 695 Park Avenue, New York, NY 10021 ($7.00 plus $1.00 shipping/handling). |
| PUB TYPE | Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021) -- Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120) -- Reports - Descriptive (141) |
| EDRS PRICE | MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS. |
| DESCRIPTORS | Academic Libraries; Computer Networks; Higher Education; *Library Collection Development; Library Cooperation; Library Materials; Library Networks; *Library Planning; *Shared Library Resources; State Aid |

ABSTRACT

The six papers in this collection, which were presented at the 1991 Library Association of the City University of New York (CUNY) Institute, focus on the theme of library collection development: (1) "Evolving Knowledge Resource Access Systems: Keynote Address" (Peter R. Young, Executive Director of the U.S. National Commission on Libraries and Information Science); (2) "Cooperative and Collaborative Collection Development: Planning and Outcomes to Date in the University of California Experience" (Julia Gelfand, Applied Sciences Librarian at the University of California, Irvine); (3) "City University Resource Sharing--Is It Possible?" (Susan Vaughn, Associate Librarian for Collection Development at Brooklyn College, CUNY); (4) "The SUNY University Center Libraries' Participation in the PAClink Project and Two Other Grants" (Suzanne Fedunok, Assistant Director for Information and Research Services, State University of New York (SUNY), Binghamton); (5) "METRO's Collection Development Programs--How and Why They Do or Don't Work" (Rhonna A. Goodman, Assistant Coordinator of Programs and Services, METRO); and (6) "Collection Development: Survival Tactics in an Age of Less: Annotated Selective Bibliography" (Mimi B. Penchansky, Head, Online Search Service, and Suzanne R. Katz, Interlibrary Loan Librarian, Queens College, CUNY). (MAB)

***********************************************************************
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
***********************************************************************

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
● Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

ED345743

# COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT: SURVIVAL TACTICS IN AN AGE OF LESS

## Selected Proceedings of the 1991 LACUNY Institute

LACUNY Occasional Paper No. 7

The Library Association of the City University of New York
New York
1992

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

IR054046

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Pamela Gillespie

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

# COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT: SURVIVAL TACTICS IN AN AGE OF LESS

Selected Proceedings
of the 1991 LACUNY Institute
April 12, 1991

Sponsored by the Library Association
of the City University of New York

Edited by

Pamela Gillespie
Hunter College

and
Susan Vaughn
Brooklyn College

LACUNY Occasional Paper No. 7

The Library Association of the City University of New York
New York
1992

# Table of Contents

Evolving Knowledge Resource Access Systems: Keynote Address 1
Peter R. Young, Executive Director
U.S. National Commission on Libraries and Information Science

Cooperative and Collaborative Collection Development: Planning and Outcomes to Date in the University of California Experience 14
Julia Gelfand, Applied Sciences Librarian
University of California, Irvine

City University Resource Sharing--Is It Possible? 26
Susan Vaughn, Associate Librarian for Collection Development
Brooklyn College, CUNY

The SUNY University Center Libraries' Participation in the PAClink Project and Two Other Grants 35
Suzanne Fedunok, Assistant Director for Information and Research Services, SUNY Binghamton

METRO's Collection Development Programs--How and Why They Do or Don't Work 39
Rhonna A. Goodman, Assistant Coordinator of Programs and Services, METRO

Collection Development: Survival Tactics in an Age of Less: Annotated Selective Bibliography 43
Mimi B. Penchansky, Head, Online Search Service, Queens College, CUNY
Suzanne R. Katz, Interlibrary Loan Librarian, Queens College, CUNY

# EVOLVING KNOWLEDGE RESOURCE ACCESS SYSTEMS

## Keynote Address

Peter R. Young
U.S. National Commission on Libraries and Information Science

### I. Introduction

We are in the midst of a controversy about the survival of research libraries. The dispute is being fueled by unrelenting increases in scholarly journal prices. Tensions resulting from new technologies and the changing global economic landscape are prompting calls to draft radical new institutional missions for academic and research libraries. With changes in the patterns and conduct of research, the argument goes, our research libraries must change accordingly or they face extinction or irrelevance.

Should university libraries be planning new and revised missions to meet the future needs of students, scholars, researchers, and faculty? How will the needs of these future academic library patrons differ from today's users? Or will the traditional research library mission allow for the integration of new technologies and services with more traditional services? Rutgers' Peter Graham has expressed the dilemma well by asking: "Should libraries only react to changes in their environment, or attempt to act upon that environment?"[1]

This paper explores the transitional context of the academic library environment by examining the transformations occurring in the world of scholarly publishing, interconnected network systems, and the conduct of research. The focus is on large and diversified U.S. universities such as the City University of New York (CUNY) System with 200,000 students on 21 campuses -- what the New York Times has recently termed a "huge and often stodgy bureaucracy facing serious financial and educational problems."

The purpose of today's institute is to explore tactics for the survival of the academic library. In order to be successful, I believe that we will have to go beyond mere survival for academic and research libraries. In an effort to further this possibility, this paper will offer a few personal observations about the academic and research library strategic environment of the next decade.

My remarks reflect my personal views and do not necessarily reflect the policies of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science or the White House Conference on Library and Information Services.

As librarians, it is our responsibility to foster change where appropriate but also to preserve the historic values of the library profession when required. The success we have in making decisions, in meeting challenges, and in helping to shape our dynamic institutions over the next decade will, in large part, determine the survival of our libraries by the evolution of new missions, or our institutional decline in an age of reduced resources.

---

[1] Peter S. Graham. "Research patterns and research libraries: what should change?" in *College and Research Libraries*, July 1989, p. 433.

## II. Challenges facing academic and research libraries

How can research libraries respond to the multiple challenges presented by: declining collection budgets; escalating prices of scholarly journals; rapid deterioration of print collections; increased internationalization of scholarly media; fluctuations in world currency rates; increasingly specialized nature of scholarly sub-disciplines; and the proliferation of scholarly information resources in digital and other formats? Each of these challenges places financial pressure on the university library, along with increased demand for a wider variety of information support services, at a time of financial stringency and budgetary reductions.

The forces creating these challenges for the academic and research library community result, in large part, from the following three sources:

1. an economic restructuring of the scholarly research and publication process;
2. the emergence of a scholarly electronic communication network;
3. the impact of the evolving electronic university on the academic and research library.

This paper examines the impact of these three sources of change. It assumes that academic and research library collection development and management concerns are components of a coherent system of scholarly communication. Further, it assumes that the system of scholarly interaction and research exchange is currently facing structural changes.

Over the last two decades, technology has influenced scholarship and the conduct of research. The extent of this change and the degree to which academic libraries respond to these forces, however, is not a subject of universal agreement. Although we speak of "access replacing ownership" for college and university libraries, few would argue that our traditional print-library and organizational structures provide the resilient environment needed to plan the research library of the 21st century. As USC's Peter Lyman has phrased it in a recent article in *Change* (Jan/Feb, 1991, p. 34):

> "The system of scholarly communication is in crisis. It cannot be revived by returning to traditional models, for the origins of the crisis are to be found in radical changes in the economics of the traditional print library, in addition to fundamental changes in the nature of scholarly communication brought about by technology."

We require a process for creating and testing new, reformulated, and expanded missions for our university and research institutions. These missions must balance our concern for maintaining the professional values and traditions associated with preserving the intellectual record, while addressing the demand for new services, and new approaches toward collecting and delivering scholarly resources to meet the changing needs of research and instruction in the world of higher education.

The title of this paper, "Evolving Knowledge Resource Access Systems," conveys a sense of the opportunity and potential that academic librarians have for a dialogue about what new missions and services are needed to support the dynamic instructional and complex research missions of their parent institutions. The title does not connote a tone of imminent disaster which often characterizes recent hard decisions by academic and research librarians responsible for collection development deselection projects.

Rather, the title recognizes that in facing the current challenge there is the seed of creativity and evolutionary development made possible by the shifting paradigm of scholarship. The title also acknowledges that the evolution of new knowledge access systems is underway. The roles research libraries play in this evolving interconnected global network must be clearly identified in order to clarify the place of the university library in the life of the scholar.

## III. The crisis in academic and research libraries

What is the nature of the crisis in the system of scholarly communication? Are our traditional models for exchange of learned information, research results, and scholarship no longer functional? Has the adoption of technology fundamentally changed the nature of research and knowledge representation? Are the radical economic changes affecting the traditional print collections of the academic and research library indicative of the imminent demise of the entire system? Is the "information age" about to claim the research library as an institutional casualty?

In a more specific sense, are the rates of increase for subscription prices to scholarly journals over the past decade a fair reflection of publisher's cost increases, or are certain non-domestic commercial scholarly publishers charging prices set to derive exorbitant profits from the U.S. market? Is there merit to complaints that faculty and researchers are overpublishing in efforts to achieve academic tenure and promotion? Is all that is published actually necessary? Will the scholarly publishing industry of the future provide network access to scholarly information directly to students, faculty, and researchers, by-passing the college and university library?

In order to respond to these questions and to plan tactical actions to address the current academic library collection development crisis, the strategic trends influencing the global knowledge environment need projection and analysis. If we frame the problem carefully and objectively, we might in the process be able to identify possible solutions.

## IV. Scholarly journal pricing trends

What recent trends are reflected in scholarly journal subscription prices? In statistics reported by the U.S. Department of Education's National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) through the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) for 1988, the nation's 3,400 academic and research libraries spent a total of $462 million for 6.4 million current periodical subscriptions. If current pricing trends continue at their present rate, these same libraries will spend $1.1 billion for these same serial subscriptions in 1995. This projection is important because the total 1988 acquisition expenses for these same institutions was $1.3 billion. It appears that the university library actually has become what University of Virginia librarian Ray Frantz has characterized as "the serials doomsday machine." (*Publishers Weekly*, 8 February 1991)

Research libraries are hardest hit by subscription price escalation. Kendon Stubbs from the University of Virginia, writing in the introduction to the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) Statistics for 1989-90 notes that "...median serials expenditures rose 52% from 1986 to 1990. In the same four years, however, the prices paid by [research] libraries rose 51%, to a median price of $132.45 per subscription." Thus, the 94 U.S. ARL universities, spending $259 million for serials in 1989, are receiving roughly the same number of subscriptions that cost $165 million in 1986, a difference of $94 million.

Where did research university libraries find this additional $100 million over four years? ARL statistics indicate widespread cancellations of high-priced serials, reduced monographic expenditures, and increased interlibrary loan. Despite this, the total number of serial subscriptions is no greater in 1989/90 than 1986 levels. Median figures for ARL university libraries show that 58% of library materials budgets is spent on serials; and overall, 35% of total annual operating expenditures is going toward materials, with 50% to salaries. If current trends continue at the same rate, ARL university libraries will be spending 80% of their entire acquisitions budgets on current serial subscriptions by 1995.

If the CUNY libraries, with 25,000 current serial subscriptions and a declining serials budget of $2.7 million, were to be compared with ARL universities, CUNY would rank 12th in serial titles purchased and 34th in serial expenditures for 1989/90. The difference in ranking for these two comparisons is most likely due to differences in the composition of the CUNY library system title mix compared with the ARL member institutions. At an average subscription price of $97.40, CUNY system libraries are paying 36% less per title than the typical ARL university library. Even though the CUNY libraries are not buying the Science-Technology-Medical mixture commonly found in ARL, six CUNY libraries have cancelled over $700,000 worth of serial subscriptions in the past three years. The problems of the university community are painfully illustrated by CUNY's dilemma.

Recent trends in scholarly journal prices have been well documented in the library literature. Examples include the following:

> "Much has been written about the prices of journals. Librarians are told each year about rates of inflation; subscription prices in various subjects are compared; the evils of institutional or library pricing are decried. We hear that U.S. libraries are being overcharged for their foreign journals and that exchange rates are being unfairly applied." -- Sandra Moline ("The influence of subject, publisher type, and quantity published on journal prices" in *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, vol. 15, no.1, March, 1989, p. 12.)

> "In recent years considerable attention has focused on dramatic price increases among scholarly journals, yet this is but one element in a "double explosion" -- an explosion in price and quantity -- that has characterized scholarly journals and devastated libraries' budgets." -- Dennis Corrigan, ("The political economy of scholarly communication and the American system of higher education" in *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, vol. 15, no. 6, January, 1990, p. 332.)

> "The venerable, centuries-old system of scholarly publishing and collection building in research libraries is in very real danger of collapse. Dramatic increases in both the numbers and prices of scholarly journals, especially scientific scholarly journals, are the most obvious manifestation of this impending crisis....To date, none of the attempts by research libraries to cope with these dual crises of information glut and spiraling price inflation have been very successful. In fact, the most common strategies, that is, pleading for a larger acquisitions budget, or transferring dollars from monographs to the serials budget, have actually aggravated the problem by accommodating or hiding it rather than dealing with underlying causes. " -- Gary D. Byrd ( "An economic "commons" tragedy for research libraries: scholarly journal publishing and pricing trends " in *College and Research Libraries*, May 1990, p. 184.)

> "Research library collections have faced a complex budget squeeze for more than ten years. Escalating prices and burgeoning numbers of journals combined with limited budgets have placed tremendous pressure on research libraries to maintain a "balanced" collection of serials and monographs to meet the educational and research requirements of students and faculty." -- Robin B. Devin and Martha Kellogg ("The serial/monograph ratio in research libraries: budgeting in light of citation studies" in *College and Research Libraries*, January 1990, p. 47.)

It is clear that academic librarians have been writing about the serials pricing problem in the library literature. In an ironic twist, articles about the price increases appear in the very scholarly communication vehicles which are the subject of concern. Clearly, scholarly journal price increases over the past few years demonstrate the need for a rigorous economic analysis of recent trends and pricing practices.

As we have observed, scholarly journal publishers argue that price increases to libraries result from overall increases in the fixed and variable costs of publishing, and that discriminatory pricing policies by which libraries are charged substantially higher prices than individual subscribers are justified by the fact that many readers will benefit from a single institutional subscription. These arguments would appear to be cogent, if it were not for the difficulties which force university libraries to cancel serial titles in order to afford subscriptions to a reduced title list .

Can we attribute rising prices of scholarly resources chiefly to publisher strategies aimed at achieving a monopoly over the communication of research? Or, are they the result of other forces and actually symptoms of a paradigm shift in the research process? Further, are these forces destabilizing universities and national research policy in general? The solution to our research library budget crisis may lie outside the control of the university library, depending on the answers to these questions.

## V. The economic restructuring of scholarly publishing

Journal articles published in scholarly sources provide a means for facilitating specialized communication among learned colleagues, as well as a mechanism allowing scholars, scientists, and researchers to be in touch with one another between formal meetings. An ancillary use also allows students to share in the process. The scholarly journal was designed originally to mediate the separation of time and distance between conferences and meetings. They served as a channel of communication for gathering intellectuals together, to transmit ideas, exchange thoughts, and to pass messages through a print technology adapted specifically for a regular and systematic process. Journals, unlike monographs, were intended to continue indefinitely just as consistent publisher revenues were meant to flow continuously through subscription sales.

As with all products of collective human activity, the scholarly journal has fostered certain cultural attitudes and behavioral customs which are appropriate to the specific "society." Certain subjective or psychological factors are important to the maintenance of the culture and values common to the printed scholarly journal as it exists today. The formal mechanisms for editing, reviewing, and critically assessing the scholarly merit of peers' work reflect a culture developed over many generations. The scholarly communication process embodied in the academic journal reflects those values that form the bedrock foundation of the academic community's very identity. Roots of the system of scholarly publishing are intertwined with the university reward mechanism forming a unified whole which is amazingly resistant to change.

The intellectual community functions performed by the scholarly journal allow for critical review by peers with dissenting or contrary views. This process has components to assure the freedom required to perpetuate the community of scholars, while, at the same time, allowing revolutionary concepts to surface which challenge accepted truths.

But what happens when the machinery of scholarship is endangered by economic and technological forces which are beyond the control of the system itself? What happens when the system of scholarly communication itself is threatened by a paradigm shift?

In order to place this issue in perspective, it is useful to review a recent macro-economic commentary. Writing in a recent *Chronicle of Higher Education* article, Kevin Kearns presents an alternate view of today's global economic landscape:

> "The American economy today is being radically transformed by the trade and foreign-investment patterns established by the rise of Japan, the economic integration of Europe, and the deindustrialization of the United States....in spite of the massive changes under way, much of the academic community acts as though it's business as usual.
>
> "The vast majority of our economic and political thinkers ... believe that the free market is busy allocating resources in the most efficient way possible, and that our nation will be better off for the changes. Unfortunately, they're dead wrong. ...A battle is raging today for control of critical technologies and sectors of the U.S. economy, with accompanying effects on our political system. ...To withstand the challenge to our economic and political way of life, we must change the way we think about doing business.
>
> "Members of the academy cannot stand aloof in this time of crisis and wait to write the history or rewrite their theories after the fact. Neither should they be permitted to explain away predatory foreign behavior by spouting theory that does not apply to the globalized marketplace. We need our best academic minds to help formulate a new national economic strategy now." (Kevin L. Kearns, Senior Fellow at the Economic Strategy Institute, writing in the March 27, 1991 *Chronicle of Higher Education*, p.B1-3).

This view of the changing global economic picture helps to place the serials pricing crisis and the research paradigm shift into a larger context. If Kearns' economic conceptualization is correct, the research library economic crisis goes beyond our serials budget difficulties and, indeed, goes beyond the university. If correct, the crisis is one of global concern and has a direct bearing on the nation's future economic competitiveness and productivity.

## VI. The emerging electronic scholarly communication network

One national program receiving significant attention from the university community involves the development of a digital national network which could serve as the basis of a new electronic paradigm for scholarly communication in the future. During the last five years, legislation has been introduced in Congress calling for the establishment of a high-capacity, broadband, advanced national data communications network for research. Over the years, congressional interest has grown as this concept has evolved into a plan for an integrated national research and education network (NREN) consisting of an advanced communication network linked to a variety of computational and information facilities and services.

Senate bill 272, introduced by Senator Albert Gore early in the first session of the 102nd Congress, acknowledges that information resources are being linked as common resources throughout networks to users at desktop workstations. The NREN legislation (now law) addresses the need for better coordination in the design and operation of these systems. The infrastructure of this interlinked set of technologies is considered by some to be a strong basis for the development of a universal broadband information system. A very high-capacity digital communication network and information service, as visualized, would carry entertainment, educational, and social services to the home and support a broad range of business and educational services. A nationwide network for research and education could be a starting point and gradually broaden the vision.

Even considered apart from the economic crisis facing research libraries, digital technology is fostering change in the representation and distribution of knowledge. Like other units in the campus community, libraries in the recent past have used technology to automate internal procedures and records. The focus today is more on knowledge and access issues which involve the university library in joint efforts with campus computing centers to plan for NREN implementation through organizations like the Coalition for Networked Information.

The difficulty with a vision that looks to NREN to solve our economic problems is that the costs and policies associated with the emerging digital national network are not well known, especially since Internet, or the de facto NREN, currently receives federal subsidy. Nor, for that matter, are the roles of government, the private sector, or university libraries well defined in our vision of the emerging national digital highway. Work of the recently formed CNI task forces in clarifying portions of the NREN vision is extremely useful, but the effect of technological innovation on the social relationships and organizational forms with which we manage scholarly communication today are virtually unknown. We need to understand the impact of technology on traditional scholarly values, academic accountability, and intellectual independence.

## VII. The academic library and the electronic university

The mission of the research university is evolving in response to the adoption of new electronic technology. Symptoms of change are to be found in the conduct of today's research and in the transition to the wired campus of the future. Students of the future will use interactive multimedia technology, in conjunction with more traditional printed text. For example, students will soon be able to view various interpretations of dramatic scenes or interactively explicate the historical context of a particular phrase or poem. In another application, students can explore Mayan ruins or the detail of Michelangelo's Pieta using a system employing the photographic realism of high definition color image display, videos of scholarly lectures, and systems which enable the student to interact with resource material in a more direct and realistic way. The next decade will bring dramatic changes resulting from an historic transition away from the manufacturing of print products towards distributing information resources.

These changes reflect the changing nature of relationships in the research and teaching communities. The following points provide an indication of some of these changes in the conduct of research and the implications of these changes on the missions of university libraries:

1. Research has become increasingly analytic. This trend results in a greater concentration on quantitative information and data, rather than a dependence on the published results of research.

2. More research is being performed by teams of specialists, often working in collegial networks or co-laboratories which span the globe. The consequence of this trend is a greater use of informal reports shared among peers in the "invisible college" and a greater reliance on the data produced by prior studies, rather than full published research outcomes.

3. Research is increasingly directed toward solving a specific problem. This application orientation places less emphasis on performing exhaustive review of the published literature, especially if solutions can be developed without the investment of time in researching the literature of prior investigations.

4. The growing volume of research literature increases the difficulty of managing information, interpreting data, and filtering massive volumes of research.

5. Research incentives (especially in the scientific, technical, and medical fields) are increasingly competitive in nature, especially when federal government grants are involved, but also with international awards and private support of university-based research programs.

6. Research is increasingly specialized, with branching and "twigging" often occurring for fields which are subsets of other specialized areas. These twig fields require specialized literature support for practitioners.

7. Research is increasingly cross or inter disciplinary requiring researchers to draw from near or allied, or even non-related subject literature in order to obtain literature in support of team activities.

8. Access to published research by non-research-oriented students is increasing. Even high school students, as well as undergraduates and non-institutional researchers are demanding access to scholarly articles.

9. The costs of performing research are increasing and are beginning to threaten those institutions which have been both the leading research and teaching universities. If these schools can only afford to perform research, the medieval model of the university may be history.

Review of the basic research model places these trends into perspective. Research, especially scientific-based research, is performed in order to foster creativity and discovery. The success of research demands that discoveries must be shared in order to expose the original thought, idea, or discovery to a critical community which can either verify, appreciate, and replicate the results, or show the originator that the truth is different.

Science in its most rudimentary sense, finds order and meaning in our experience. Human progress often involves the discovery of a new order which gives unity to what seemed unlike. The act of creation lies in the discovery of a hidden likeness. This act is original, but the knowledge created is universal because each of us re-creates it as we re-discover the truths first uncovered by the originator.

At the time of Scientific Revolution in the 16th century, most wealth resulted from trade. It was therefore natural that science focused on problems of trade, navigation, and exchange. The Industrial Revolution in the 18th century shifted the source of wealth from trade to manufacturing requiring greater amounts of mechanical energy. Science has therefore been preoccupied well into the 20th century with problems concerned with energy sources.

Recently, our post-industrial "Information Revolution" finds scientific interests moving away from the generation of energy to its control and manipulation, particularly in the form of the control of power processes such as the digital computer and the associated network communications infrastructure.

A characteristic invention of the Scientific Revolution was the telescope. The characteristic invention of the Industrial Revolution was the power machine performing the routine work of human muscle. The characteristic invention of the Post-Industrial Revolution is the control mechanism which performs the routine work of the human brain. Scientists invented the computer to serve research needs during World War II. The invention of the printing press in the 15th century created the conditions for the development and flourishing of modern science and scholarship. Not only did the press allow authors to communicate their ideas accurately, but the qualities of the medium stimulated entirely new methods and institutions of learning.

Electronic information technology is similarly changing the nature of basic research. The character of research -- the way data are collected, analyzed, studied, and communicated -- has changed because of technology. Similarly, the data generated by research is growing at unprecedented rates. The human genome database is projected to eventually contain over 3 billion units of information. Earth observation experiments in space will collect and sent to earth trillions of units of data daily. A single image of the U.S., with resolution to a square yard, contains nearly a trillion data points.

The changes in research libraries over the last two decades have paralleled changes in the research and the university communities. The same technology which facilitated the automation of university library internal procedures over the past decade is influencing the larger arena of our parent institutions. Those same digital computational and communication technologies which brought us internal process control systems are now functioning as the raw material for rebuilding the infrastructure of much university and research activity.

Similarly, the cultural values reflected in academic status and tenure issues, peer review of research, and generally accepted notions of value within the scholarly "economic" arena are undergoing review and examination. Public concern about recent incidents of scientific fraud, inaccurate research data, and professional misconduct are symptomatic of a wider concern about the increasingly competitive nature of activities related to academic prestige and federal grant awards.

Another important area of concern is reflected in policy questions about the ownership of intellectual property in the emerging electronic network and the relationships between owners of scholarly information resources, libraries, and the users of these resources in an electronic environment. Two recent court decisions provide a glimpse of future concerns (and confusions) about intellectual property ownership in the emerging national digital network.

One is the settlement of a copyright infringement suit against Kinko's Graphics Corp. which operates a chain of photocopying stores frequently located near college campuses. The plaintiffs, including several major academic publishers, represented by counsel from the American Association of Publishers, charged that two Kinko's stores copied excerpts from 12 of their books, compiled the excerpts into five 'packets', or anthologies, and sold these packets to students attending classes at NYU, the New School, and Columbia. The case was decided by U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York. The Judge awarded the plaintiff publishers' statutory damages and injunctive relief for the copy shop's willful infringement, after rejecting the defendant's claim that its service is necessary to the educational process. Damages totalled $510,000. This is likely to become an important court decision affecting the climate for future copyright infringement suits brought by owners for liberal interpretations of the 'fair use' provision of the Copyright Law.

In another recent copyright court decision, a March 27th unanimous Supreme Court action involves the protection of factual material compilations. In this case the court denied copyright protection for the alphabetical listing of names and addresses in the white pages of a phone directory. The case illustrates that copyright protection is inappropriate for compilations which do not reflect original selection or arrangement. While it has been a tenant of copyright for some time that facts cannot be copyrighted, this ruling will likely cause database publishers to think twice about making the investment of time and effort required to compile factual material. (*New York Times*, 3/28/91)

In the volatile and changing climate of legal, technical, and economic transition, what tactical actions can collection development librarians in universities pursue? The tactical options are grouped below:

1. Financial and Economic Concerns:

Even if the CUNY libraries were in a position to restore cuts and increase the size of the serials budget to cover scholarly journal subscription price increases, this would not solve the problem. Such a tactical response is but a temporary solution to the crisis. Scholarly journal publishers would most likely respond by increasing subscription prices based on the new elasticity of market demand. If libraries continue to meet increased serials prices through budget reallocation from other areas of operational expenses, the situation will continue to degrade over time. A stronger, but more painful, financial tactic is the selective cancellation of serial titles based on clear and balanced criteria reflecting the priorities of the parent institutional system.

Cancellations require careful planning to be effective. Comparisons of duplicate subscriptions or multiple subscriptions to the same journal, serials index service, or CD ROM-based system should serve as the basis for shared subscription negotiations with publishers. Document delivery of articles among the CUNY libraries could provide economic efficiencies even without program consolidation with the system. With this city as the base for many non-domestic scholarly publishers. CUNY libraries could approach selected suppliers with innovative proposals which test a number of different use-based article services, in paper or electronic formats, to provide practical experience with non-subscription delivery alternatives.

Distribution of information is closely related to pricing. What is needed is more information to compare old and new methods of distribution to determine those features that are complementary and those that serve different roles. Currently, for instance, the needs for archiving and for disseminating scholarly information are merged in a single mechanism: the scholarly journal. Separating the issues associated with these two functions may help to sharpen and extend the development of possible future scenarios for electronic publishing, electronic journals, and electronic articles.

We have been assuming that the new electronic network for scholars will come about through large systems in comprehensive offerings. This is not usually the way change occurs. It is much more likely that successful changes will begin small and grow over time. Institutions such as CUNY that experience drastic cuts are challenged to experiment with radical and innovative ways of addressing the threats of change. The opportunity for developing and experimenting with new economic models for serials services may come along with the trauma of even deeper budget cuts forced by the State, that present university libraries with no other choice but consideration of radical new measures.

### 2. Legal and Ownership Concerns:

Reasserting university ownership of scholarly journals and the encouragement of faculty to cease publishing in premier scholarly journals that charge excessive subscription prices would, if consistently applied, bring about change. In reality, however, this is not guaranteed to produce changes in researchers' publishing patterns or on demand for scholarly works. Changes to the existing intellectual property statutes to allow more resource sharing among university libraries under a more liberally constructed "fair use" provision could allow research libraries to substitute article document delivery in lieu of paid subscriptions to scholarly journals.

Exploration of site licenses or flat-priced institution-wide licenses for university systems could provide a reasonable financial alternative to the cancellation of individual subscriptions. Careful consideration should be given to shared collection development, resource sharing, and article delivery arrangements because of the impact these measures have on the traditional mission of the research library.

The area of intellectual property ownership is complex and not always benign for academic librarians. Experiments with alternative systems require specific contractual terms which protect parties from possible liabilities. In essence, the legal policies which govern the economic relationships between parties are the most complex aspect of the emerging new systems for delivery of scholarly information.

3. Network Resource Sharing and Delivery Concerns:

Continued reduction of acquisition budgets and cancelation of expensive scholarly journal subscriptions quickly are forcing university libraries to extend new electronic document delivery services through which articles are scanned or faxed directly to the patron. Resource sharing and document delivery activities require standard technology platforms and uniform mechanisms for accessing, representing, and delivery of bibliographic information, as well as intellectual content in a variety of formats and media.

A critical element in the exploitation of the network linking technology is the need to understand the scholar's needs and to comprehend the behavioral differences between print expression and interactive knowledge representation technology. We should probably stop talking about the electronic journal or the electronic library. The analogy may, in the long run, be more confusing than helpful.

4. Strategic Policy Concerns:

In order to foster change, experimentation, and innovation the university library community should develop closer links with the many participants in the system of scholarly communication. Librarians from the research arena need to participate in interdisciplinary forums to discuss the solutions as well as the problems. We can use our strengths in the preservation arena to address problems of technology integration into other areas of professional concern.

Our efforts to influence policy must recognize that, while we may not be in control of pricing, we do have natural allies among faculty and researchers who play a critically important role in scholarly communication policies. Our efforts should be directed towards encouraging publishers to employ responsible pricing policies. We should be seeking strategic alliances and proposing new pricing models for testing which would allow publishers of scholarly works to gain experience with new methods of dissemination. One such model might involve discussion of a scholarly network patterned after the Corporation for Public Broadcasting as described by John Witherspoon at the CNI meeting on March 18, 1991.

We need to bear in mind that research libraries and scholarly publishers have a system of mutual dependency. Future systems of scholarly communication must acknowledge these relationships and build upon them through mutual trust and responsible action.

## VII. Conclusion

Finally, I would submit to you that currently academic and research libraries need a resurgence of creative excitement directed at recasting our institutions and our professional mission. This creative thrust is especially needed in the face of the very serious erosion threatening our budgets and scholarly resources in what has been termed the "library doomsday machine." To counter this, we need new missions which emphasize the renewal potential of knowledge representation technology.

What is at stake in the current crisis is not simply the viability of the research library in the future; we face the even greater potential erosion of research objectivity and validity. University libraries don't need more money to buy more scholarly journals. Rather, they need strategies to address the changes caused by a newly developing paradigm for research. These strategies must transfer the spirit of democratic community and scholarly values of research to the emerging electronic university. The spirit of excitement and discovery, the joy of creativity, and the human potential for freedom released by scholarship and learning demand that the commitment of our discipline be directed toward the rejuvenation and remediation of knowledge services to scholars.

# COOPERATIVE AND COLLABORATIVE COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT: PLANNING AND OUTCOMES TO DATE IN THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA EXPERIENCE

Julia Gelfand
University of California, Irvine

Some of you may remember the flush times of the late seventies through mid-eighties when we could not spend money fast enough and enrich our collections satisfactorily to aspire to the "world class" institutions our library and university administrators dreamed about. That is when we created cataloging and processing backlogs which took years to dwindle, introduced retrospective conversion to centralize machine readable records, and kept our staffs busy until the tough times came.

Now we have to consider planning before spending, examine duplication rates, face high double and triple inflation in serials costs, decline in available space, deterioration of materials and forced recognition and implementation of preservation and conservation practices, plus evaluate and reduce total library services and hours. This dismal picture poses all the more challenges today as the economic prognosis of the nineties is full of gloom.

I will not dwell upon the negative impacts but instead share with you how we in the University of California (UC) have thus far addressed our goals for cooperative collection development and management, hoping that some of these aforementioned problems can have a positive outcome and pose exciting new challenges.

My comments describe the components of a research library collection and will cover on site vs. remote access to collections, outline present and ideal configurations for UC Library collections utilizing regional library facilities, and suggest some elements of a model for access to library materials that maximize availability to produce the greatest cost-benefit per expenditure for library materials budgets. I am not a spokesperson for the University of California; the comments and speculations are mine, and I am here as a line librarian who has participated in the Librarians' Association of the University of California (LAUC) Task Force on Shared Collections for the past two years. My remarks are consistent with the "one library" concept articulated in the University of California Libraries: A Plan for Development of 1976. It needs to be noted that UC Libraries include Stanford University Libraries, which often participate in resource-sharing programs with UC.

I will outline the structure and background for cooperative collections at UC and tell you what has been accomplished to date in the practice of cooperative collections, what the current situation is and define some of the goals for the coming few years. There are obviously some organizational and political constraints, and I will share what some of the barriers to implementation of more cooperative efforts are.

UC is the largest public research institution in the State of California and is composed of nine campuses in a state whose population is nearly 30 million. Regionally it is broken down into four northern campuses and five southern campuses and a San Francisco campus totally devoted to graduate and professional allied and health care curriculum and research. The other campuses serve undergraduate and graduate populations and cover multiple disciplines at various levels of strength in the fine and performing arts, humanities or letters, social and behavioral sciences, physical and life sciences, applied sciences and technology, business and management.

Most campuses have several professional schools representing law, architecture, veterinary science, medicine, dentistry, nursing, information science, and business/management. Two "flagship" campuses, Berkeley and Los Angeles, have been around the longest, and the others have really developed exponentially since the early 1960s, forcing great and rapid growth in library and information resources. Concern exists within the university for core collections, expanded core collections for Masters degree level support, a research level and comprehensive collections.

Each UC campus has a budget allocation for library materials which is driven by what is known as the Voigt-Susskind formula. I want to give you a short introduction to the historical and current budgetary process for UC. This materials allocation budget has until recently been sacrosanct and could not be used as discretionary money to cover other expenses, except to support and supplement collections. The components of the algorithm are: FTE enrollment, a shelflist count recommending a number of monograph volumes or holdings (which is complicated by integrated shelving of books and journals and the variation in defining what constitutes a serial record) for a discipline not always defined by specific publishing trends, level and number of courses taught in a subject area, plus in some years a very minor adjustment for inflation. However that last component has not been factored in for the last four years.

The Voigt-Susskind formula is now more than 20 years out of date and has not been updated to reflect new academic emphases and programs, curriculum and research interests. Until recently support for that came from existing dollars at the expense of existing programs which may have begun to flounder. It has become increasingly common for extramural funds to be requested from a local chancellor, analogous to start-up costs for faculty or the example of five years of local seed money for a collection to support new academic units at my campus in East Asian Languages and Literature since we had nothing in Chinese, Japanese or Korean and are expected to render a doctoral program beginning next year. Development or advancement efforts are becoming more prevalent on each campus to supplement library materials and resources, and different models exist on each campus.

The traditional model of collection development has eroded and faculty have been replaced by librarians and subject specialists to initiate most purchasing of library materials. Depending on the gift and exchange potential to enhance collections, all campuses have faced different and difficult problems, and academic libraries have come to depend increasingly on independent and internal development or fundraising efforts and campaigns to enrich collections. We can all acknowledge how different the entire acquisitions programs have become in recent years with more sophisticated interaction with jobbers, vendors, suppliers and agents instead of direct negotiations and dealings with publishing houses. We live in a world of subject descriptors and profile parameters and think of approval plans and blanket ordering as a right of passage in obtaining our information products.

The UC budget comes from a request made to the State Legislature. The Department of Library Affairs for the University handles the number crunching and makes the pitch to the Legislature. A budget line for the entire UC is sent to the President and is then divided up specifically for the independent campuses and directed to individual chancellors. The materials budget is part of a line called a provision for allocation for all campuses and for 1990-91 totaled $36,395,423. That sum covers all library materials, the operations of the two regional storage facilities, the operations and functioning of the Division of Library Automation which mounts the system-wide public catalog known as MELVYL and its additional bibliographic databases, the Shared Acquisitions Program, and the system-wide membership in the Center for Research Libraries.

While the UC campus libraries must have collections adequate to serve their local research, instructional and public service programs, they must also exploit every possible means to share collections, especially low-use materials. Resource sharing is but one means of making sure that collections budgets are used as wisely as possible and that UC library collections continue to grow ever richer and more diverse through careful planning. For all its potential efficacy, however, resource-sharing cannot replace local campus collections that must be adequate to support local campus programs.

A comprehensive resource-sharing program encompasses a broad variety of activities: shared purchase and ownership; coordinated assessment of system-wide collections strengths and weaknesses; distribution of formal responsibilities for collecting, processing, preserving and sorting library materials; responsive document delivery systems; coordinated use of the Center for Research Libraries and other external resources; training for selectors and collections program administrators; and joint grant applications.

To succeed, resource-sharing is dependent on adequate access systems; thus a basic premise of this program is that convenient on-site access to certain kinds of materials is traded for acceptable levels of access from other libraries in the UC system.

Since the mid-1970s, the UC Libraries have participated in the Shared Acquisitions Program of shared purchase and ownership of expensive, low-use materials, including microform sets, manuscript collections and data services. It is impossible to estimate with any accuracy the savings that have accrued through this program of joint purchases, but the most conservative estimate would have to be several million dollars. Currently, the libraries are developing a capability beyond the Shared Acquisitions Program to take advantage of special purchases of opportunity, chiefly manuscript collections that often must be purchased as soon as they appear on the market. Such a strategy promises to be quite effective in building unique research collections within the University of California. While a portion of the total materials budget is set aside each year for the Shared Acquisitions Program and other shared expenditures (e.g., memberships in the CRL), the campus libraries also have the option of using their own funds for shared purchases and other shared projects.

Since 1976-77 when the first set of shared purchase requests was submitted, 3% of the materials budget was to be directed to this program, and decisions were to be made by representatives from each campus who are charged with identifying important but low use and expensive resources, titles or microform sets which could be shared with finding aids found on each campus. In actuality, the Shared Acquisitions Program receives about 2.7% of the budget today, with most of it committed to ongoing subscriptions and multi-segment released microforms. The criteria for this aspect of resource sharing are defined as requiring finding aids or indexing tools to accompany the title, it must be in a format that is shareable and the holding institution must be willing to provide the service for it, the cost must exceed $3000, the title must have cataloging copy, and holdings need to be checked at the Center for Research Libraries and on the RLG and OCLC networks.

The assistant directors for Collection Development on each campus comprise the Council for Collection Development (CDC) which is charged by Library Council. Library Council is University Librarians from each campus and university administrators from University Hall in Berkeley/Oakland, the vice-chancellor for library programs, director of Division of Library Automation, and current chair of the Librarians Association. CDC meets four or five times a year and one meeting is devoted to the selection process for shared acquisitions.

A call is issued for bibliographers and selectors to identify appropriate recommendations by December. Internal submissions are evaluated on each campus and then directed for system-wide review. Every bibliographer or selector has input into the process and each campus then ranks its own priorities, and the CDC considers those recommendations at that February meeting.

What has evolved is that the pool of available support has shrunk immensely with ongoing expenses eating up an increasingly greater part of the pie. This year we had $1,118,735 for everything and next year it will be significantly less, with an anticipated $220,000 available. In reality that allows for about $50,000 for new materials.

The outcome of this is a review of ongoing subscriptions, making certain that holdings reflect that a specific title was acquired under shared purchase agreements and perhaps cancellations will be made.

An important key to this collaboration is the formal commitment to responsibilities by individual libraries within the system. Formal commitments might include any of the following or any combination of two or more guidelines:

a. to maintain subscriptions to specific serial titles such as with the science, engineering and medical translation journal project. In it regional representatives from each campus determine a dollar amount of support and take on a 5-year commitment to maintain an expensive title or group of titles. Retention responsibility for a given title includes continuing its subscription for a period of at least five years, and agreeing that the title will not be canceled after five years without notifying other campuses at least six months in advance.

Collection responsibility is defined as follows: all titles assigned a rating of 1 (very high importance) on the individual campus lists will be funded out of that campus' library materials budget; all titles assigned a rating of 2 will be funded through shared acquisitions.

Other commitments included in the agreement are 1) timely processing of the title, using the expected standard and appropriate level of cataloging and listing all acquired materials on MELVYL; 2) binding the title and assuring that missing issues or volumes from the years covered by the retention agreement are replaced to the extent possible; 3) providing expedited interlibrary lending including expected standards for turnaround time; 4) holding campus may store a title in either regional library facility and will have first priority in storing such a title, provided another copy is not already in the facility; 5) in-house serial record for each title assigned to campus will be tagged and a note included that indicates the special nature of the subscription, the funding source and the specific retention period after which the title may be cancelled upon notification of the other campuses; 6) subscribing to a journal for which another campus has accepted retention responsibility is not prohibited; and 7) the agreement will be monitored by the active participants.

At the end of the 5-year period, the CDC will review the agreement and recommend whether it should be continued as is, revised or cancelled.

b. to acquire current library materials in specific subjects and areas (e.g., Melanesian art) at specific collecting levels such as North American Collections Inventory Project (NCIP) level 4);

c. to maintain retrospective collections in particular subject areas at specific collection levels;

d. to build and/or maintain specific format collections (e.g., newspaper backfiles);

e. to assure that specific collections are preserved;

f. to share responsibilities for storing materials in specific subjects or formats;

g. to enhance access to online resources and data products such as the Wilson indexes or IAC databases; and

h. to coordinate dependence on the Center for Research Libraries for certain kinds of materials.

While these guidelines are meant both to stimulate and to guide further development of such collaborative programs among the campuses so that formal resource-sharing arrangements with the UC system and between UC libraries and other appropriate libraries will become routine, no comprehensive program for coordinating collections has been developed. It has been more fruitful to develop discrete programs such as the Shared Acquisitions program and the pilot projects which resulted in programs for the sharing of science translation journals, Pacific Rim trade journals and East Asian newspaper backfiles or dividing up the aerial photograph collection for the State of California.

Other things that have been learned in the process of establishing these programs and redefining some guidelines:

1) Not all library collections are suitable for collaborative projects. Core collections needed to support campus instructional and research programs are not suitable for formal cooperation;

2) Agreements do not have to involve all UC libraries or even all those in a region and some of the most effective efforts may involve only 2 or 3 libraries - remember agreements should be developed among all those for whom the program is feasible and useful;

3) agreements or contracts should be positive not negative and libraries can practice collecting levels higher than commitments if deemed appropriate;

4) UC libraries should provide appropriate incentives to encourage collaborative collections programs, including funding from the Shared Acquisitions Program;

5) Those responsible for materials selection at the campus libraries are best able to plan and implement collaborative projects and activities. Groups planning such projects should involve the fewest number of persons needed to get the job done and should focus clearly on the task of developing formal written agreements, and each planning group will include a liaison from CDC;

6) Administrative expenses such as travel should be kept to a workable minimum in the development of collaborative agreements. Electronic mail, fax, and conference calls have proven effective to date.

In drafting written agreements, the following will generally need to be considered:

a. a clear statement of what the participating libraries are committing to; levels of collecting responsibilities, language coverage, etc., expressed as much as possible in language and concepts of NCIP;
b. a minimum of five years should be established for agreements;
c. a commitment to notify all participants in the agreement if a library is unable to sustain its commitments along with a specific time between notification and implementation;
d. clear statement of commitments to responsibilities such as processing in a timely fashion, including expected standard and level of cataloging appropriate for the materials, listing all acquired materials on MELVYL; providing expedited interlibrary lending; coordinating submissions to regional library facilities; determining formats most suitable for lending (e.g., microfilm or fiche);
e. any other relevant stipulations that will serve to insure the success of the agreement;
f. a brief plan for monitoring the agreement;
g. the endorsement and signature of authorized administrators of the participating libraries.

I am responsible for monitoring cooperative collections of expensive atlases for the UC/Stanford Map Libraries Group. This selections group (which was the stimulus for a discussion group on shared map acquisitions in research libraries formed three years ago by ALA's Map and Geography Round Table) meets twice a year.

Another example of coordinated collection efforts is "coordinated assessment." During the 1980s, the UC libraries began a coordinated assessment of collection strengths and weaknesses through participation in the NCIP (also known as the National Conspectus). By 1991, most conspectus divisions have been completed. Conspectuses have been done by teams of bibliographers, coordinating assessment methodologies and monitoring results. Though NCIP has had many secondary benefits (e.g., promoting networking among subject bibliographers), it has not as yet been used as a tool for organizing collaborative collection development activities (e.g., assigning responsibility for preservation, collecting, microforming newspapers).

Another assessment tool that some UC libraries use is: the National Shelflist Count (NSC). Broader participation among the UC libraries in the NSC might have useful results. Coordinated assessment that leads to a better understanding of strengths and weaknesses in the UC library collections and thus to stronger overall research collections is encouraged. Regarding a "distribution of formal collections responsibilities", there are a few informal collaborative collection development arrangements and some commonly shared understandings of collection strengths (e.g., Davis in agriculture), basically it can be said that a distribution of formal collections responsibilities among the UC libraries is still being developed. Guidelines for collaborative collection development have been written and approved; three projects have already been implemented and several more are in various stages of planning and development.

As this part of the program develops, it is hoped that more areas of collecting will be covered and that, especially in the lesser used areas of the University's research collections, coordination will result in richer university-wide collections and more effective use of resources. Formal agreements have focussed chiefly on distribution of acquisition and retention responsibilities; in the future it is hoped that a broader range of collaborative possibilities can be exploited, including coordinated preservation and use of the regional library facilities.

An expensive component of coordinated collection development for the UC is the use of the Center for Research Libraries. As members of the CRL, the UC Libraries coordinate membership activities in two ways:

1) Selected acquisitions proposals that are not funded under the Shared Acquisitions Program are sent forward to CRL as purchase proposals and are supported in the CRL voting.

2) UC libraries individually proposing titles to CRL notify other UC libraries so that those proposed titles can be supported in the voting. Lastly, our membership fees are paid by the Shared Acquisitions Program and do not need to come out of individual campus operating expenses.

The newest efforts in coordinated collect development for UC have been programs initiated to train library selectors in resource-sharing. With so many librarians having joint positions or dual assignments as reference librarians/bibliographers or catalogers and selectors, this effort began in Fall 1990 and stresses the development of formal written collaborative collection development agreements. So far several subject area librarians have met regionally in both the north and the south with a convener and facilitator and representative of CDC. Librarians with collecting assignments in ethnic studies--particularly Chicano Studies, Black Studies, and Asian-American Studies--Linguistics and Cognitive Studies, Anthropology, Education and Psychology, Mathematics and Physics have had their initial meetings.

A major goal in coordinated collection development has been creating opportunities for joint grant applications. A successful resource-sharing program is an excellent basis for joint grant applications. Some examples of this are the map cataloging programs and the Japan-U.S. Friendship Commission grant now regularly received by UCLA and UCSD.

Other ongoing examples of cooperative collection efforts underway in UC are: "Policy for Acquisition of and Access to Computer Files" which addresses the use of state funds for the shared acquisition of or shared access to computer files. It applies to all funds that might be used for university-wide acquisition and access, including regular campus funds, University Department of Library Affairs funds, funds especially appropriated by the Office of the President and funds available through Shared Acquisitions Program.

There are several precedents for the use of shared funds for computer files including MELVYL MEDLINE in 1986 as a joint venture between Shared Acquisitions and local campus funds. Computer files covered by this policy can be bibliographic, textual or numeric and currently include ISI's Current Contents which was mounted in July 1989 and the forthcoming addition of IAC's Academic databases and possibly some Wilson Indexes. Preliminary investigations are under way for the TIGER or 1990 mapping and census tapes, some of the Michigan Social Science Data Archives and other discipline-specific databases which can be mounted and/or accessed through gateways.

Computer files obviously pose more complex issues and procedures than other formats, thus the need for a separate policy. Computer files may be owned, leased, or available by a subscription for access; require specific computer software and hardware to access, frequently require extensive user education and assistance, may also require longer lead time to develop proposals, negotiate contracts and implement programs, and most importantly are a greater expense.

A document released in summer 1988 entitled the Working Group on Access to Electronic Databases Report identified more than anyone would want to know about planning for adding databases to MELVYL.

In concluding my comments about the Shared Acquisitions Program, I want to mention other pilot resource sharing projects for which we have committed only modest monies and hope one day to expand. The Pacific Rim Trade Journals is one example of a program which will likely need to be revised because it is geographically dependent rather than industry driven and forces the information user to engage in research in an inconvenient and unnatural direction, considering how most social scientists such as geographers and economists work. Perhaps not.

The proposed project to control serial costs in the physical sciences is just getting started, and this program will facilitate the rational cancellation of science and technology journals and coordinate new journal acquisitions.

You can conclude that the Shared Acquisitions Program is the major commitment made to cooperative or collaborative collection development, but I am pleased to share with you some other programs that have recently progressed from the embryonic stage to neonatal development.

LAUC two years ago formed a Task Force on Shared Collections which was charged by librarians not administrators, CDC or Library Council and has recently submitted several recommendations to foster better cooperation. Basically they are the following:

1) create a database of all collection assignments on each campus by having a directory with standard job titles and definitions of assignments, so colleagues can easily contact one another. Entries would include listings with name, address, telephone number, electronic handle, fax number and subject parameters. LAUC must

insure that all bibliographers and selectors have intercampus communication access via Internet and Bitnet;
2) recommend expeditious fee-based alternatives to traditional interlibrary loan which offer full-text delivery of articles;
3) create a complete listing of all microform sets within the UC system including full cataloging records;
4) develop a collection development strategy on a regional and system-wide basis;
5) enhance support for interlibrary lending and borrowing services;
6) coordinate serials cancellations regionally and system-wide;
7) better utilize regional storage facilities for resources bought by shared acquisitions funds;
8) monitor the UC CRL membership to document utilization; and the two most important recommendations: to link periodical or bibliographic indexes on MELVYL to campus holdings and to link on-order files or automated acquisitions files with every campus.

You can tell some of these are rather controversial and will generate plenty of discussion, but we all know that if procedures can be formulated and operational funds provided, the cost benefit would be substantial in the long run.

What are the obstacles in doing any or all of this? I speculate the most serious drawback is that this kind of planning does not fall into the traditional strategic planning commonly practiced in academic libraries. The management of each of these suggestions is new and different and few models exist from which to learn. The barriers are basically logistical and campus-specific and require both administrative and financial support to coordinate meetings and create pilot studies. The greatest frustrations are how long it takes to implement any recommendation and the time needed to evaluate effectiveness.

We know it is not all that common when the six major works on collection development released in 1990 failed to include cooperative or collaborative collection development. It is up to those of us here to reinforce the need to share resources and exercise our creative talents, realizing that most libraries will not have a high percentage of what is published and no institution will have what it needs. What we, as librarians responsible for collection development and management, are providing is access to information retained elsewhere, and we need to educate and inform the leadership in accrediting agencies and other bodies that volume count does not always reflect total holdings.

I want to end with a quote from Paul Mosher,

> "Cooperation is achieved by working ahead, planning and reflecting and talking with both users and colleagues about the collections, the programs, and aspirations for the collections of the future."[1]

---

[1] Mosher, Paul, (1989), "Cooperative Collection Development: Collaborative Interdependence," in Shoemaker, Sarah, ed., Collection Management: Current Issues. (New York: Neal-Schuman Publishers).

Other references which may be useful in consulting:

Guidelines for Shared Collections and Access Program for the University of California Libraries (July 16, 1990). Handout available at program.

Kimball, Jane A., "Cooperative Collection Utilization in the University of California Libraries: A Concept Paper," Unpublished paper, 5 April 1991.

Brief Guidelines for Collaborative Collection Development and Management Among the University of California Libraries, Revised document, April 10, 1990.

# CITY UNIVERSITY RESOURCE SHARING--
# IS IT POSSIBLE?

Susan Vaughn
Brooklyn College

Once upon a time there was a large city on the East Coast of the United States. It was peopled by immigrants looking for ways to better themselves. In 1849 this city formed an academy to provide free public higher education for men, and later, the same benefit for women. Around the turn of the century, a commission was formed to determine whether the two should be combined for greater efficiency, economy, and to eliminate duplication. Alas, the answer was no, and each went forward independently. The future of this grand social experiment might have been very different if the answer had only been yes.

In the meantime, our city was growing. In 1929 a college was established in the hinterlands and in 1936 yet another. The first Free Academies established branches and professional schools. They began to offer masters programs as well.

Bureaucracy grew as well. In 1926 a Board of Higher Education was formed, in 1945 a Council of Presidents, in 1960 a position of Chancellor, and in 1961, riding on the wave of Sputnik and the 1950s science expansion, a university was created. It was deemed qualified to give doctoral programs in Chemistry, Economics, Comparative Literature, English, and Psychology.

It sounds very simple and logical, but life is simple only in fairy tales or morality plays. It was not an auspicious beginning for the third largest university system in the country, the City University of New York.

At the beginning of the 1960s the libraries of the major colleges in this new university were all in cramped quarters, understaffed, and underfunded. All, except the very first Free Academy, were seen as undergraduate institutions and supported as such. Their combined materials budget was about $300,000. Keep in mind that this represents four separate institutions with very similar programs requiring duplication of basic resources. Other universities were funded at much higher levels: Columbia, $432,000; Harvard, $755,000; University of Michigan, $503,000; and Stanford $327,000.

Since it was located in the same city as the preeminent public library in the country and numerous world-renowned research collections, it was decided that this university could rely on these specialized collections. Meanwhile, a library at a central location was established which was meant to be supplementary, with basic periodicals and a basic reference collection and a very basic budget. A union catalog was to link the resources (however inadequate) of all the campuses.

The Chief Librarians of these separate institutions had been meeting informally since the 1940s dealing with such issues as common personnel practices, collections, acquisitions policies, interlibrary loans, and allocation of responsibility for building collections in specific areas.

As the university expanded during the 1960s so did the Council of Chief Librarians. It was looking for ways to assert its eminence in university library matters, no mean feat considering the Council was a part-time endeavor, with no central coordination, no staff, and each member reported to the President of his or her individual college.

The need for a University Library Dean, Coordinator, or Director as the position was variously called, was debated in various incarnations throughout the 60s. The concept was even voted down once by the Council. However, in the late 1960s the Office of the Dean was created. Richard Logsdon was appointed in July 1969 after a long search. He was unappointed by the then Vice Chancellor Timothy Healy in August of 1971. Since he had been given no funds, no authority and no staff, it made little difference.

All the proposals for more central library direction had a strong resource sharing or collection development rationale. The system wide inadequacy of the collections was well known. Headway was made on some collection issues during these first decades.

In 1968 the newly developed Clapp-Jordan formula for collection size was applied to CUNY libraries, and they were found to be a million volumes short of the standard. A second formula was developed by Morris Gelfand of Queens College and adopted by the Council, but never implemented.

The need for a union catalog to facilitate interlibrary loan had been acknowledged with the creation of the university and before. The attempts to produce one throughout the 1950s and 1960s make painful reading.

A Union List of Serials was produced in 1968. Delivery systems to improve interlibrary loan were proposed, but not adopted.

Access and borrowing arrangements for graduate students and access provisions for undergraduates were adopted.

A ten year or so flirtation with the New York Public Library for provision of services to CUNY faculty and doctoral students was aborted. This was to have relieved the university of a huge financial burden. When it ended in failure nothing else was proposed.

The 60s, in retrospect, were the crucial period for the development of the university. New (expensive) programs were being proposed and implemented at the doctoral level, professional programs offered, new campuses opened--all with little regard for the basic adequacy of library collections, staff, or physical facilities. Most damaging was that the library collections were developing autonomously as were the academic programs.

The mid-1970s brought the fiscal crisis and retrenchments. Book and serial budgets were slashed and professional staffs were reduced 29% at senior colleges and 21% at community colleges.

In June 1979, Chancellor Kibbee gave recognition to the fact that the university's libraries were unable to support the university's mission: teaching, research, and public service. He organized a Task Force to make recommendations for the future. They reported in December 1980. What made this task force different from earlier commissions, groups, and task forces was that library technology had put some previous recommendations within the realm of possibility. If there was a will there was now a way.

The Task Force used the ACRL Standards for College Libraries as the format for its report. Objectives, collections, acquisitions and organization of materials, staff, reference and reader services, facilities, administration, and budget were examined.

Significant budget recommendations were made, most notably that the City University libraries be funded on a par with the State University libraries. Faculty status for librarians was reaffirmed and increased support staff ratios were proposed.

However, the most important recommendation was the creation of a University Library System with an Office of Cooperative Library Services under the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Authority, staffing, and funding were included with this recommendation.

Under the direction of this Dean, resource sharing and cooperative acquisitions, a union catalog, supplementary funding to strengthen already strong collections for doctoral support, a university wide collection development program, and a cornucopia of other good things was supposed to happen.

While the report was never fully implemented as recommended it did give the impetus for the appointment of William Myrick of Brooklyn College in 1982, first as University Director, CUNY Union Catalog. By 1983 the title was University Director for Cooperative Library Planning and Development and in 1986, University Associate Dean for Libraries. This begins the most fruitful period in CUNY library history.

A union catalog was implemented, based upon a strong planning document by an ad hoc committee led by Marsha Ra of City College. This was about 30 years after the first recommendations for such a catalog were made. OCLC and the impending implementation of AACR II made this necessary as well as desirable.

In 1987, the union catalog project developed into the Office for Library Systems, headed by Marsha Ra, as Director of University Library Automation Services. An online public access catalog was implemented. The obvious benefits of a university system were presented to the CUNY administration and won out over individual campus automation initiatives.

Other resource sharing initiatives were also begun:

The CUNY Data Archives was developed under the direction of Bliss Siman at Baruch College as a shared resource. The cost of the membership in the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research is shared by the colleges, but a portion of the director's salary and some support time is provided by the central office. This gives faculty and students access to a wide variety of numerical and statistical information.

An analysis of the materials budgets of SUNY and CUNY showed very unequal funding and although the funding was not equalized, a "match program," however inadequate, was initiated to provide funds for graduate level programs.

An experiment using fax had been conducted by Brooklyn, Hunter, and Queens College libraries in the spring of 1989. The demonstration project was a success and the central office acted on the recommendation that fax machines be provided for all of the interlibrary loan offices in CUNY to speed delivery, especially for faculty.

The central funding of commercial document delivery services to supplement traditional interlibrary loan is also an innovation implemented centrally on the basis of the recommendation of an Ad hoc Committee on Resource Sharing. Currently, three services are supported.

In the early 1980s an Ad hoc Committee on a University Wide Collection Development Policy was established with Matthew Simon of Queens College as chairperson. The committee recommended that a position for a university-wide collection development officer be created to coordinate the evaluation and assessment of university collections and phase into a coordinated program. No action was taken on this document.

In 1990, a report of a similar Ad Hoc committee on Resource Sharing composed of the Council's Collection Development Committee and a previously constituted Ad hoc Committee on Resource Sharing, recommended the creation of a position, to be funded by the Dean's Office, to coordinate and initiate various resource sharing efforts within CUNY. Through Dean Myrick's office and the forward attitude of the Chief Librarian at Brooklyn College, 25% release time was negotiated for this position from October 1990 through May of 1991.

The emphasis has been on developing a plan for collaborative collection development, expanding access to information, and attempting to coordinate cancellations in a time of fiscal contraction. If it had been possible to act on the first report, some groundwork would have been done before the financial problems of the 1990s descended.

Many, if not most, of CUNY's recent collaborative efforts have been successful. A state-of-the-art online union catalog is in operation. Access and borrowing among CUNY libraries is virtually universal. There is priority interlibrary loan service by fax and other methods.

Elements for effective resource sharing are present, and there is even a financial crisis to reenforce the sense of urgency. Materials budgets are shrinking dramatically; faculty are complaining. Yet resource sharing in the expanded sense of the concept has not been welcomed. Following are some reasons why.

1. Lack of central programmatic authority within the university.

The City University was recently described as "consortial" in the 1989 Report of the Task Force on Science, Engineering, Technology and Mathematics. In other words, there is institutional autonomy, even though many of the doctoral programs could not be accredited without a central office or authority.

Each college jealously guards its own prerogatives and programs, especially those which bring in significant revenue. Other institutional arrangements might have been imposed at CUNY's inception, but it will be very difficult to change now. The Chancellor has, however, appointed a task force to study this issue.

Libraries are academic "support" services, probably the most expensive support service within the university. It is obvious that collaborative library efforts should follow, not lead, university programmatic collaboration.

2. Libraries are seriously underfunded.

From its inception as a university in 1961, the libraries have never been funded to support the programs which were offered. The central administration has always been aware of this. Years were spent attempting to forge an official affiliation with the New York Public Library to compensate for CUNY library inadequacy. The cooperative programs of METRO have long been used to justify new programs and degrees.

The detailed study of the funding of the libraries of the State University of New York, especially the University Centers, done by Dean Myrick showed that CUNY libraries were funded on a level with SUNY four year colleges. No recognition was given to expensive science and other doctoral level programs. The response of the State has been the initiation of a $300,000 per year match program to support graduate level research. Many of the colleges cannot raise non-tax levy money to match their portion of the $300,000.

Funding also means staffing. The libraries and the Office of Library Automation are all understaffed.

3. Library acquisitions are not centrally funded.

The Presidents of each campus determine library budgets. There is no accepted formula or rationale for how the libraries should be funded, much less any authority to enforce the formula. This creates "good years" and "bad years." Funding is not consistent. Brooklyn College could be experiencing financial difficulties when Queens and City colleges are experiencing very high budgets and extra allocations.

Libraries are complex organizations within other complex organizations. Often budgets are not known until well into the fiscal year. It is difficult to coordinate across campuses when not all libraries are facing the same financial situation.

4. Geography.

The campuses of the City University are far enough apart to create inconvenience, but not far enough for anyone to seriously contemplate coordination of resources. The availability of resources of other college and university libraries, while desirable, also detracts from the necessity of a coordinated CUNY effort.

5. Competitiveness.

There may be a City University, but there is also a Brooklyn College, a City College, a Hunter College, a Queens College. Librarians are just as seduced by numbers of volumes and serial titles as classroom faculty are by amounts of grant support and other accepted indicators of quality. Librarians are just as jealous of local autonomy as other faculty.

A "university mentality" as opposed to a "college mentality" does not currently exist. If it did, our faculty would be interested in CUNY maintaining subscriptions, rather than individual faculty and individual libraries making special arrangements with other libraries outside CUNY.

6. Fear of resource sharing.

In the best of times no one considers resource sharing. In the worst of times resource sharing is hailed as a panacea. CUNY has an obligation to locally support at least its undergraduate programs. Resource sharing programs should not be viewed as substitutes for adequate funds, although there can be significant savings if shared programs are tailored to fit needs.

Resource sharing should be geared to provide materials beyond the "core collections" which each library should have. In CUNY, this is not the case. How can four campuses have adequate "core collections" to support doctoral level research in the physical and biological sciences? CUNY libraries are already being asked to share "essentials" which is why there is resistance.

7. Unequal interlibrary loan services.

Each campus decides how to fund, with staff and resources, local library programs. Resource sharing depends upon interlibrary loan offices being given a very high profile and a high priority. This is a position which should be staffed with most innovative, creative, and motivated people. They are collection development officers as much as any bibliographer, and have a bird's eye view of local campus needs.

The burden of cuts in periodicals and monograph purchases has fallen on interlibrary loan. Yet recognition in terms of resources has not been forthcoming. How can libraries share access or ownership to an expensive resource if the library which has responsibility for retaining it has run out of xerox paper, if the staff is ill and there is no one to copy the article needed, if the library doesn't have staff to reshelve books and periodicals so that the item shared is not where it belongs when it is needed? Trust is an essential component in shared resources.

8. Autonomous decision making and lack of leadership.

A catalyst for cooperation is needed. Someone needs to rally people to look at the present and help shape the future. Collections in the 1990s should not be developed as they were in the 1980s.

--Libraries where journals are not being cancelled need to "buy in" to the solutions being developed by those whose budgets are being cut.

--Libraries should assert their responsibility and their prerogative to shape collections, and not allow decisions to be made by the most vocal faculty who have no view beyond their own narrow subject field. Each library which allows decisions to be made in this manner affects every other library in the system.

--Libraries should never cancel an expensive title without consulting with other subject bibliographers in the system.

--Libraries considering purchasing an expensive periodical title or resource should not do so without consultation.

--Libraries should not allow, without serious protest, their entire budgets to support periodical collections. This is a distorted solution to a problem and seriously harms undergraduates and scholars whose disciplines are more "book related."

So, is cooperation really more difficult to get than money? What is the future? What is possible?

CUNY will embrace some forms of collaborative collection development and resource sharing out of necessity. Following are some areas which may develop.

1. Greater sharing of existing resources.

The CUNY+ online catalog is showing us what resources are available within the university. Information on monographs, periodical status (active or cancelled), periodical check-in and circulation are all elements which will make the CUNY open access program and the inter-campus loan program more valuable.

Previously low use items will be given new life. Expensive microform collections, with proper catalog access, will increase in use, as will the data archives.

2. Expansion of CUNY+.

The Office of Library Systems plans to expand to make CUNY+ more than just an online catalog. Indexes and abstracts and current content information such as that from CARL and ISI will become available. Catalogs of other libraries, such as the New York Public Library, will be accessible. This will be the beginning of the "scholar workstation" for CUNY faculty and students. All of this is dependent upon maintaining staff and funding for the Office of Library Automation.

3. Shared purchase program.

Expensive, little used resources, such as microform collections could be purchased jointly with shared acquisitions dollars. METRO has been doing this for years with their Cooperative Acquisitions Program, and CUNY is a natural affinity group for this. Lending of microfilm from these collections is also possible.

Joint purchase or joint support of extremely expensive periodicals or other resources might also be explored.

4. Data archives will expand.

Numeric and textual data are becoming more important to scholars in all disciplines. The CUNY Data Archive will expand in resources and influence. Librarians will become more aware of these sources.

Methods of accessing the 1990 census are currently under discussion. A uniform approach to the purchase of software for the tape and CD-ROM versions could possibly be centrally funded. Faculty and students will use these sources at various campuses and be assured of the same protocols for use.

5. Expansion of document delivery programs.

Vendors other than ISI, University Microfilms, and Chemical Abstracts Services can and will be utilized. Perhaps not all will be centrally funded, but these are economically feasible ways to expand collections.

The concept of keeping a "last copy" of a journal within CUNY will be modified if the journal is available through a commercial document delivery service. There is a question, however, whether centrally funded document delivery will make libraries more independent and insular rather than encouraging greater dependence and cooperation.

6. Faculty will "buy in" to access rather than ownership.

This will happen faster if financial necessity makes it so, but realistically, no library can provide everything which a researcher needs. Faculty, even science faculty, look at coordination of library support with a positive attitude, especially when it works.

Also, the "scholar's workstation" of the "electronic library" of the future is predicated on access to databases for which access to materials needs to be negotiated. It is really interlibrary loan in an electronic environment.

7. Faculty reward system for promotion will change.

Libraries may not be responsible for this, but ultimately the reward system will change, and the amount of scientific and other literature will be more controllable. The National Science Foundation, the Association of Research Libraries, the Chronicle of Higher Education and the recent Carnegie Foundation Report Scholarship Reconsidered have all called for a reexamination of the system.

8. New York Public Library/City University relationships.

There will be better coordination of collections between the New York Public Library and the City University. Cooperative programs might be looked at in targeted subject areas. Reproduction and photocopy services might be an area of discussion.

9. Interlibrary loan will greatly increase in importance.

This service will expand in staff and resources. The success of document delivery and resource sharing is dependent upon ILL. Within the last year and a half, this service has seen change in traditional methods of delivery with the use of fax and document delivery services.

A pilot project for the testing of a statistical software package was developed by Queens, Hunter, and City and was funded by the central office. If successful, valuable collection information will be captured.

A subcommittee will soon be working on an experiment to see if e-mail can be used for interlibrary loan.

10. Coordination of collections in various subjects.

Collaborative collection development will not happen to any great extent in the foreseeable future. Too many factors mitigate against the implementation of coordinated collection development across the campuses. This does not mean an end to the desirability of a collaborative approach, but the will is just not there.

The METRO Collection Assessment Program has urged assessment of our collections in a uniform, objective and scientific way. CUNY+ shows what we have and what we do not have.

There will be increased communication concerning cancellations and new titles. Decisions may be made cooperatively rather than unilaterally.

11. A collaborative collection development plan will be developed.

An outline for the future will be developed and possibly adopted by the university, stressing programs that are currently feasible and suggesting directions for the future.

12. Electronic publishing.

We have not yet exploited the benefits of cooperation in the age of paper and microformats, whether it be a failure of will or vision. Perhaps when scholars have all or most of their information instantly accessible in electronic format this type of discussion will not be necessary.

The City University missed an opportunity in 1907 when City College and Hunter College failed to merge "for greater efficiency and economy." It may not have mattered so much at the turn of the century, but in an age of information explosion, we can no longer afford to proceed as in the past with great duplication of collections. Perhaps financial expediency which seems to be driving us toward a "downsized" university will bring the opportunity again.

CUNY has a very special mission and a very unique student body. Our city is still peopled by immigrants although their languages and often their color have changed. These students should be given every opportunity to excel. They deserve a first rate education and first rate libraries.

Documents Referred to in the Text:

Myrick, William J. Coordination, Concept or Reality?: A Study of Libraries in a University System. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1975.

City University of New York. Report of the Task Force on Libraries. New York: City University of New York, 1980.

Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on a University-Wide Collection Development Policy. Chairperson, Matthew Simon. Submitted to Dean William J. Myrick, 1984.

City University of New York. Report of the Task Force on Science, Engineering, Technology and Mathematics. New York: City University of New York, 1989.

Report of the Joint Ad Hoc Committee on Resource Sharing. Chairperson, Susan J. Vaughn. Submitted to Dan William J. Myrick, September 1989.

Report on Coordinated Collection Development. Prepared by the Council of Chief Librarians Collection Development Committee and the Ad Hoc Committee on Resource Sharing. Chairperson, Susan J. Vaughn. Submitted to the Council of Chief Librarians, May 1990.

# THE SUNY UNIVERSITY CENTER LIBRARIES' PARTICIPATION IN THE PACLINK PROJECT AND TWO OTHER GRANTS

Suzanne Fedunok
SUNY Binghamton

This paper describes three projects in operation at the State University of New York University Centers at Albany, Binghamton, Buffalo and Stony Brook. The four libraries are involved in an experience of planned and managed dependence, most recently resulting from the creation of a merged union catalog. This approach may not work, it is certainly radical in its scope, and it has been planned rather than the ad hoc "if you build it, they will come" approach mentioned by some network planners. To quote from one of the grant proposals, "We firmly believe that SUNY Centers can define new national standards for cooperation and service. By focusing on real needs rather than on building redundant collections, the SUNY Centers will become more responsive, more financially responsible, more manageable. In addition, they will be more visible leaders in use of technology." (l)

As Patricia Battin wrote in 1980: "Effective cooperation will necessitate the sacrifice of some degree of autonomy. Many of our consortium and cooperative activities of the past have made the fundamental mistake of attempting to share resources without giving up our basic notion of the autonomous organization of libraries." (7)

The "virtual library" constituted by these four institutions would rank in the top ten among Association of Research Libraries members. In the aggregate their acquisitions budgets total approximately $11,500,000 and their collections comprise about 6,500,000 volumes. Separately they are average, mid-sized, state-funded libraries, subject to typical problems of rising administrative, faculty, and student expectations and diminishing resources.

In 1989 the four library directors agreed on a series of "strategic directions" for cooperation among the SUNY University Center Libraries. The statement aims at cooperative development, collection access, and resource sharing. The rationale is that economies of scale are to be realized in increased cooperation. Like all libraries, the four university centers want to strengthen public services and increase access to resources. The centers will have much more clout negotiating vendor contracts, licenses, and equipment purchases by working together. Services can be provided more economically in a cooperative environment.

Quoting from the document, the four libraries are committed to the following:

--giving high priority to retrospective conversion

--giving high priority to completing the Conspectus

--sharing information about new serial subscriptions and candidates for cancellation before final action is taken

--exploring joint licensing of periodical databases in electronic format and providing access through campus mainframe networks

--exploring an efficient, reliable, and affordable electronic document delivery system

--working together to get administrative, budgetary and systems support for joint programs

--encouraging interaction among collection development, access, and systems offices of the libraries

--maintaining open communication among the libraries. (3)

This document signalled the beginning of a new era of cooperation among the four University Center libraries. The three grants described below are helping these libraries to implement their strategic directions. The projects are still under way. There are no final reports available on any of them and the work is very much "in progress."

## TITLE IID GRANT

The Title IID grant involved the four libraries sequestering backfiles of about 200 medium use serial titles in a variety of subjects and substituting telefacsimile delivery service from a central collection in Buffalo. This project tested the feasibility and explored the costs of 24-hour document delivery of serials in a controlled environment. Another aspect of the grant was testing digitized transmission of documents, and the final segment will involve document delivery in a non-sequestered environment. A report is expected in June 1991 on the first two parts of the research project.

## PACLINK PROJECT

In 1989 the SUNY University Center libraries started a project with NOTIS Systems Inc. to link the four library catalogs by 1993. The project involves l) single, remote database searching (merged OPACs)--that is, using the host computer, a library user can search one database on a remote computer without being directly connected to the remote computer; 2) 24-hour document delivery of items on interlibrary loan using high-speed telefacsimile transmission, and 3) multiple simultaneous remote database searching. PAClink uses NISO Z39.50 standard to transmit and receive requests, permitting the local library to design its own help screens, formats, and protocols because the user is never directly connected to the remote system.

The Title IID and PAClink grant projects deal with new technologies in libraries by working to improve innovations already in other systems. Library systems in Illinois and California have merged catalogs and document delivery services. The introduction in the SUNY University Centers of the latest generation of technology or software to foster combined catalogs or document delivery is important, but each new generation of hardware is shortlived and destined to be superseded. The real novelty in the strategic initiatives program adopted is the commitment to a breakthrough on the policy and administrative side. The grant from the Council on Library Resources is helping to fund activities which, if successful, will be historic in the involvement of all stakeholders--students, faculty, administration, library staff--in making cooperation happen at more than a superficial level.

COUNCIL ON LIBRARY RESOURCES GRANT

It is not difficult to find examples of the rhetoric of collaborative collection development. Unfortunately there are few examples of interlibrary cooperation at the level envisioned by the four University Center Libraries. While the idea seems logical and reasonable, the implementation of planned dependence and collaboration at the level that makes a significant difference has not yet happened.

Several articles have appeared recently on why this may be so. Marcia Pankake summarized many of the arguments in a recent talk (5). She pointed out that political, or perhaps a better word is psychological, problems arise from the fact that cooperation increases dependence; collaboration involves persuading people to accept an idea they may not agree with; it may evoke jealousy and competition for the resources to be shared; and a loss of identity may result from this merging and sharing.

She next listed the problems stemming from "policy failures:"

1) lack of a written collection development policy statement

2) built-in deficiencies of collection development policies as a means of communicating about collections

3) gap between the aims of an institution and what is spelled out in the collection policy

4) policies that reflect institutional realities may not provide for change

5) the community served may not agree with the policy of cooperating

6) agreements may be too vague to direct concrete sharing activities

7) agreements may have ramifications beyond collection development

8) the plan for cooperation may be too poorly designed to be effective.

Pankake then goes on to enumerate some "procedural failures:"

1) cumbersome procedures may defeat cooperation

2) procedures may not be carried out. This is also largely a people problem. "Library staffs may not be trained or skilled in working the ways cooperation requires--negotiating, contracting, working via committees."

3) cooperation needs monitoring, checking, reporting and publicity. Adequate in-process information is needed, as is a message system, and a good interlibrary loan delivery system.

4) cooperation is costly, and we are in an era of shrinking resources.

The CLR grant will enable the four centers over the next two years, in the interim while the PAClink project is underway and before PAClink is "turned on," to establish a firm inter-institutional basis for cooperation. This will be done by a series of committees and task forces and a symposium. The project specifically seeks to determine what will be acceptable access to serials through a series of serial collection overlap and use studies.

The grant will also assess present attitudes of library information users so as to test for changes after PAClink is installed. The aim of the grant research is not only to identify a list of serials that may be shareable, but more importantly to examine the process to identify what has held back genuine collaboration in the past, and to get that cooperation to happen in a meaningful way in the SUNY University Centers in the future. If the project is successful, it will represent a real breakthrough. Only time will tell if the SUNY effort brings success.

## Bibliography

1. "Cooperative planning grant. The State University of New York. University Center Libraries at Albany, Binghamton, Buffalo, and Stony Brook." Grant proposal submitted to the Council on Library Resources, Washington D.C., 1990. 22 pp.

2. "Implementing Group 4 telefacsimile on a State Network: Providing high-speed document delivery among the SUNY University Center Libraries." Grant proposal submitted to the U.S. Department of Education Title IID Program, Washington, D.C., 1991. 20 pp.

3. "Strategic directions for cooperation among the SUNY University Center Libraries: Statement of principles for cooperative development, collection access, and resource sharing." [1989?] 8 pp.

4. "Faxing or Scanning: Options for Research Libraries." Grant proposal submitted to the U.S. Department of Education Title II-D Program, Washington, D.C. 20 pp.

5. Pankake, Marcia. "Perils and pitfalls in cooperative collection development." Paper presented at the Midwest Federation of Library Associations, fifth Quadrennial Conference, November 4-7, 1987, Indianapolis, IN. 9 pp.

6. Appendix A. Functional description of PACLINK. [n.d.] 7 pp.

7. Battin, Patricia. "Research libraries in the network environment." 1980.

# METRO'S COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS HOW AND WHY THEY DO OR DON'T WORK

Rhonna A. Goodman
METRO

METRO has always worked toward a "decentralized collection that is accessible to all." In its attempts to reach that goal, it has established and administered several collection development programs. This paper is an overview of their impact on the libraries in the region.

Coordinated Collection Development Aid (or CCDA) is a State Education Department program, administered by METRO, that most academic libraries have come to count on to supplement their materials budget. Its monies are to be used to enhance subject strengths to which a library has declared a regional commitment. In the last ten years, $4 million has been brought into the region in CCDA funds including $1.7 million to CUNY libraries.

CCDA was not conceived of as a stand-alone program. The State, when it established the nine reference and research library resources systems (3Rs) in the early sixties, also passed legislation which allowed for the regional systems to develop bibliographic databases for location of needed material and to facilitate document delivery among members.

In the METRO region, there are 68 academic libraries (or 37% of those in the state) that receive CCDA. In the case of the strongest and largest libraries, the funds can amount to less than one percent of the materials budget and are not statistically significant. To the weaker libraries even a minimum grant of $4500 can be well over 50% of their book budget.

The goal of CCDA is to make a significant improvement in regional collection cooperation. With a regional collecting plan, the more libraries can count on timely access to the total collection, the more readily they will coordinate collection development. The resources in the sharing community will be of a larger scope, and these resources will be accessible to all. This philosophy is much the same as that of interlibrary loan. The cost of ILL is not judged by what it would cost to buy the individual serial or book but what level of collection is needed to warrant the purchase of that particular item. With CCDA if collections are enriched significantly, at least in the smallest libraries, the increased ability to fill users requests from the library collection might actually be cause for a decrease in interlibrary loan. However statistics do not show any real changes in ILL patterns, and the impact on ILL cannot be evaluated.

CCDA impacts on the region by reinforcing the sharing system and by urging librarians to think in terms of coordinated collection development. Once a gap is identified by a collection analysis, it needs to be filled.

Academic libraries are supposed to have that impetus, but with incentives to public libraries, museums, historical societies and other cultural institutions, they too become part of coordinated collection planning.

The program, in its present form, has many strengths which help to reinforce cooperation:

- The money is mandated by the state.
- The money must be used for subject materials and cannot be used for hardware, binding, or database searching.
- In order to receive a grant, an institution is required to keep track of its budget and its ILL statistics.
- There is a built in maintenance of effort rule which is an invaluable tool in keeping administrations from reducing the materials budget. It helps librarians document and defend their budget if there is a possibility of losing aid. METRO uses this rule to help libraries in their defense.
- Membership in a regional reference and research library resources system is required.
- Participation in Interlibrary Loan is also required.
- METRO itself uses the CCDA aid package as an outreach tool and has drawn a dozen academic libraries into the cooperative environment.

The program, however, has been haunted by several weaknesses:

- Guidelines are explicit but no monitoring or enforcement has been built into the state's program. The hope is that enlightened self interest, appropriate for a cooperative system, will be sufficient.
- Changes in collecting responsibility are as the institution sees fit, not the region.
- Regional strengths are not enforced.
- In 1991, after four years of no increases, the base grant rose from $4280 to $4300, but it then was reduced 10.5% because of state budgetary problems.

The CCDA program has been in effect for ten years with no visible changes in a regional collection plan. METRO has a Resources Development Committee familiar with strengths and weakness in the region, and a Collection Inventory Project task force of librarians able to see the collection situation from a global point of view. Perhaps the time has now come for METRO to take an active role in the distribution of collection responsibilities.

Another METRO coordinated collection development program is the Union List of Serials, containing 44% of the region's holdings. Holdings are online but are mostly invisible to METRO area libraries. When monies are given to libraries for union listing, METRO assumes that they are maintaining the information, and changing holding statements once the conversion is done. It is difficult to monitor the commitment to keep information current. Through the GAC (Group Access Capability to the OCLC ILL subsystem), more libraries are now tapping into and using ULS, but it is still not a good browsing system. A union list should be useful for cancellation projects, but this one cannot always be accessed by call number and it doesn't report last copies.

Off line products are available and some CUNY institutions have taken advantage of them. Queens libraries have a special list, and Manhattan College and the College of Mount St. Vincent have a joint catalog.

An exciting enhancement to the Union List would be a title overlap analysis project, which could be used as a quantitative evaluation tool for all types of collections. This analysis could identify overlap strengths, weaknesses, and unique holdings within the group to be used for informed resource sharing. At this time it is too expensive but is certainly on the METRO wish list.

New York State's Regional Bibliographic and Interlibrary Resources Sharing Programs and the LSCA Title 111 programs have allowed METRO to administer $1.9 from 1984 to 1991 to expand access and improve resource sharing to all types of libraries by having libraries convert their holdings in carefully selected collections in high demand subjects or subjects that have a low fill rate. The monies are also used to: support MILCS (the New York Public Library Branch Library System), expand and enhance the Interloan Center, extend access to major database resources such as OCLC, RLIN, UTLAS and union catalogs of the Medical Library Center. The big weakness of this program is simply lack of money to do all that is needed.

METRO's Collection Inventory Project is projected to be a map of the strengths and weaknesses of collections in the region. Seventy-five libraries are participating. These libraries are analyzing their collections and sending METRO the data, and METRO prepares reports for their use. In theory it is the ultimate resource sharing program, showing the strengths and weaknesses of the collections in the region. In truth libraries do not assess with enough frequency and/or send their results to METRO for data entry. This project has tremendous potential but libraries have to be better conditioned to use the results of the analysis for the internal and external management of their collections. This program has no other funds except project participation fees and desperately needs more funding for support and coordination.

An enhancement to this project would be purchasing software for use at participating libraries for internal use with METRO keeping the main database.

METRO cards are the most visible sign of METRO's work toward the decentralized collection accessible for all. The yellow card has proved its success and allows METRO members to be able to use a specific item not available in a public access library. This year, METRO established a blue card which is to be used for referral to libraries with strength in a specific subject. The card is based on reciprocity and can be used only among the participants. At this time 125 members have signed up. Not all the CUNY libraries have joined this program, although it was designed for colleges to have access to important research level collections. Perhaps with the publication of the METRO 1991-92 Handbook and Directory and a listing of participants and subject strengths more libraries will become aware of the program and join.

METRO CAP (Cooperative Acquisition Plan) has been in existence for 16 years. It has purchased in excess of 200 major research works at a cost of more than $350,000. However, after careful analysis, METRO developed a new CAP designed to better meet the needs of its members. With this new CAP, any group of members with common interests can set up a CAP. Any member who participates is expected to pay one half of one percent or $8000, whichever is less. Each group is responsible for soliciting, ordering and placing the items. METRO holds the money and pays the bills, and all items purchased can be used by any METRO member. At this time the only group in existence is one with the four Research Libraries Group (RLG) libraries. The RLG CAP has worked very well. The collection development librarians meet in the fall and choose their subject. Subject bibliographers then get together and choose the titles. If a school really wants to house the item, it can offer to pay additional costs.

CUNY is another natural group for establishing a CAP, but it needs to be organized. In this day of shrinking budgets and expanding needs, it would seem that CUNY collection development librarians would want to implement this program. METRO would be most willing to help.

Coordinated collection development is a necessary survival tool, and it is crucial for METRO libraries to work together to strengthen existing programs and conceive, develop, and implement new ways for collection cooperation.

# COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT: SURVIVAL TACTICS IN AN AGE OF LESS
## Annotated Selective Bibliography

Compiled by
Mimi B. Penchansky
and
Suzanne R. Katz
Queens College

More than ever today libraries are faced with incredibly shrinking budgets and escalating costs of books and serials. Budget cuts cause drastic changes in the way we spend our funds. Libraries are forced to engage in wholesale cancellation of periodical subscriptions and still find themselves with little money to purchase books. Librarians across the nation are being forced to re-evaluate their priorities.

The City University of New York is a case in point. We are especially affected by these problems as New York State enters one of its worst recessions. Governor Cuomo has proposed a slash of $79.6 million from the University's operating budget next year. The *PSC/CUNY Clarion* reported in its March 1991 issue that "We stand on the brink of an academic disaster."

The theme of the 1991 LACUNY Institute addresses these issues. In addition to budgetary problems, automation, online public access catalogs, online subscription agencies and electronic vendor services are affecting all aspects of acquisitions: the types of materials acquired, how they are acquired, processing procedures, and personnel qualifications and duties.

In a time of diminishing library resources, administrators must often choose between acquisitions and access services. Should we continue to acquire expensive books and journals, or is access enough? What is the impact of technology on collection development? What alternatives to acquisition are available? Where has collaborative collection development and resource sharing worked, and what are the problems in implementing such programs? What are the fiscal implications of such solutions? What is the impact of technology on collection development? What criteria can be used for making tough choices?

These are some of the issues highlighted at our conference and in this bibliography.

Some of the abstracts in this bibliography were derived from those available in various online databases and existing bibliographies if the compilers considered them sufficiently descriptive of the item listed.

## THE PROBLEMS: BUDGET CUTS, HIGH COST OF BOOKS/SERIALS

Breivik, Patricia Senn, and Ward Shaw. "Libraries Prepare for an Information Age." *Educational Record*, 70 (Winter, 1989), 12-19.

Since funding levels will probably not change much, college libraries will need to shift emphasis from seeking more funding for current and new services to delivering more and better service for less, becoming leaner and more able to deliver adaptable services. Increased budget flexibility will be essential.

Budd, John M. "It's Not the Principle, It's the Money of the Thing."*Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 15 (September, 1989), 218-222.

Although many arguments in favor of user fees for library services are based on economics, little economic benefit is actually gained by levying charges for some services. A microeconomic model that has been used to demonstrate the benefits of user fees is critiqued, as is the issue of accountability.

Cargill, Jennifer. "Budgetary Constraints: The Impact of Technical Services." *Journal of Library Administration*, 10 (Spring, 1989), 39-57 .

The impact of rising costs of library materials is a reality in the late 1980s and is likely to remain with us for the foreseeable future. Technical Services staff can assist in determining how the organization deals with financial constraints. While budgetary crises do not always lead to long-term restructuring of organizations or permanent redeployment of personnel, a budgetary crisis does present the opportunity to do so.

Dougherty, Richard M. "Financial Resources." *Library Administration & Management*, 3 (Spring, 1989), 59-96.

Nine articles cover topics related to library financial resources: (l) escalating serials prices; (2) library budgeting; (3) entrepreneurship; (4) cutback management; (5) academic library budgets; (6) assessment of library effectiveness; (7) public library fund-raising; (8) capital investment; and (9) unit cost analysis describing the Virginia Polytechnic Institute Libraries experience.

Dougherty, Richard M. "Scholarly Publishers Who Charge Outrageous Prices for Journals May Get Some Unexpected Competition." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, (June 3, 1987), 40-41.

University libraries are being forced to cancel subscriptions to important research journals because of rapidly escalating prices. These outrageous subscription prices may urge competition from others. For example, the Research Libraries Group (RLG) is able to issue both paper and electronic publications at reasonable prices.

Dowd, Sheila T. "Fee, Fie, Foe, Fum: Will the Serials Giant Eat Us?" *Journal of Library Administration*, 10 (Spring, 1989), 17-38.

The author concludes: Retrenchment, in the form of serials cancellations, austerity in acquisitions, curtailment of services, staffing reductions, is for most of us a real and present necessity. Cooperation, and cooperative resource sharing, can help us mitigate some of the effects of these reductions. Communication with our campus community is indispensable; we must enlist their support for our compromises and stimulate their participation in a dialogue with publishers and learned societies. And, finally, the real costs of doing business in libraries in the last decade of the twentieth century must be identified; and strong, committed advocates must fight for needed support. That's a heavy challenge for our profession. But remember--Jack did kill the giant.

Duchin, Douglas. "Looks Like the Ball Is In Our Court--Library Support Services from Vendors." *Journal of Library Administration*, 10 (Spring, 1989), 71-80.

Duchin advises libraries to take advantage of vendors and the services they have available. Vendors can help to pick up the slack while the costs of serials and monographs go up.

Hamaker, Charles A. "Costs and the Serials Information Chain: Containing the Impact on Library Budgets." *Journal of Library Administration*, 10 (Spring, 1989), 99-113.

Hamaker highlights the rising costs of serial expenditures at Louisiana State University from 1981 to 1987, citing similar problems at other universities as well. Rising costs seem to be a "global phenomenon" for many large, medium-sized and small academic and research libraries.

Hauptman, Robert. "Periodicals: Proliferation, Pricing and the Penurious Librarian." *Catholic Library World*, 60 (January-February, 1989), 158, 176.

The author reviews the problem of rising periodical subscription costs for libraries and argues that subscribers must take a stand by refusing to subsidize greedy publishers. He suggests guidelines for increasing the effectiveness of serials budgets by decreasing the number of subscriptions.

Hewitt, Joe A. "Altered States: Evolution or Revolution in Journal-Based Communications?" *American Libraries*, 20 (June, 1989), 497-500.

Hewitt discusses the conflict between librarians and publishers as librarians try to find ways to solve the problems of increasing prices of serials and inadequate fund allocations. A series of seminars sponsored by the Society for Scholarly Publishing will attempt to involve librarians, publishers, scholars, editors, subscription agents and database vendors in a discussion of basic issues of the problem including the "publish-or-perish" syndrome, electronic publishing, the future of the scholarly journal, and methods of coping with the problem.

Jackson, Frederick H. "The Future of Academic Libraries: The Inevitability of Change." *College Board Review*, 117 (Fall, 1980), 6-9.

College and university libraries must cooperate as budgets dwindle and the need for more new periodicals escalates. We need a national periodical center modeled after the British National Lending Library as well as library automation at central storage libraries.

Lee, Sul H., Editor. "The Impact of Rising Costs of Serials and Monographs on Library Services and Programs." *Journal of Library Administration*, 10 (Spring, 1989), 1-125.

Eight articles examine the impact of rising costs of serials and monographs on library services. Topics covered include crisis management strategies; insights from the vendor's perspective; the particular problems of research institutions; the impact of tight budgets on technical processes; and options for cost savings through resource sharing and new technologies. [Articles by Sheila T. Dowd, Jennifer Cargill, Leonard Schrift, Douglas Duchin, Frederick C. Lynden, Charles A. Hamaker, and Robin Downes are cited in this bibliography]

Lynden, Frederick C. "The Impact of Rising Costs of Books and Journals on the Overall Library Budget." *Journal of Library Administration*, 10 (Spring, 1989), 81-98.

If prices continue to rise at the current rate, then libraries will be required to increase fund raising efforts, collection coordination, and resource sharing. If these strategies are inadequate, one must be concerned about the future of scholarly communication. In the meantime, collection librarians can be justifiably proud of the programs which they have pursued during the current crisis.

Schrift, Leonard. "A Period of Adjustment: Planning and Coping With Decreasing Funds in Libraries for Acquiring Monographs and Serials--A Vendor Perspective." *Journal of Library Administration*, 10 (Spring, 1989), 59-69.

The phenomenon of the spiraling cost of books and journals must be viewed and evaluated as a long term process. This has been an issue since the 1970s and is likely to stay for some time to come. The impact of the process of rising costs, coupled with the accompanying process of shrinking funds and tightening budgets, is seriously affecting libraries, library service vendors and publishers.

Young, Peter R., and Carpenter, Kathryn Hammell. "Price Index for 1990: U.S. Periodicals and U.S. Serial Services." *Library Journal*, 115 (April 15, 1990), 50-57.

The authors present the following data by subject category on 1990 prices of periodical subscriptions: (l) average price; (2) percent increases; (3) percent increase since 1981; (4) percentage of titles increasing; (5) average price by Library of Congress classification; and (6) increases since 1977. They then present comparisons with the Consumer Price Index and data on serial services. [See also *Library Journal*, 114 (April 15, 1989), 43-50, for 1989 data]

## MANAGEMENT EVALUATION, ASSESSMENT AND STRATEGIES

Alexander, Ernest R. "Cost Allocation Issues in Interlibrary Systems." *Journal of Library Administration*, 6 (Summer, 1985), 37-65.

In comparing methods of allocating service transaction costs among member libraries of interlibrary systems, questions of how costs are to be estimated and what cost elements are to be included are critical. Different approaches of estimation yield varying results. Actual distribution of units accounts for the greatest variance in allocations.

Buschman, John. "Asking the Right Questions About Information Technology." *American Libraries*, 21 (December 1990), 1026-1030.

Library professionals assume that information technology is good for libraries, librarians, and the public but instead should be asking why it is good and where it will lead. Buschman cites some philosophical changes in library practice, cautioning us to question these changes and consider alternatives. Some of the changes he questions are the growing number of fee-based services, the conception that the ability of information technology to retrieve greater quantity equates with cultural progress, the growing privatization of information, and the conception that technology, including information technology, is neutral. We must not allow the machine "to set the limits of what is valuable, informative, socially worthwhile, and logical".

Gherman, Paul M. "Vision and Reality: The Research Libraries and Networking." *Journal of Library Administration*, 8 (Fall-Winter, 1987), 51-57.

Research library directors respond to the Library of Congress' Network Advisory Committee statement, which stresses an egalitarian network environment. Gherman defines the special role of research libraries and describes the effect of their participation in local area and multitype networks.

Gore, Daniel, Editor. *Farewell to Alexandria: Solutions to Space, Growth, and Performance Problems of Libraries.* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1975).

This collection of papers, presented at the Conference on "Touching Bottom in the Bottomless Pit," sponsored by the Associated Colleges of the Midwest, and held on April 17-18, 1975, deals with the issue of growth problems in academic libraries from almost every angle. Some of the papers deal with cooperative programs, the periodicals collection, microtechnology, and no-growth, higher performance libraries.

Harvey, John F., and Peter Spyers-Duran, Editors. *Austerity Management in Academic Libraries.* (Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow, 1984).

This volume includes fifteen essays on a variety of topics including the effects of inflation, creative fund raising, interlibrary and intra-campus coordination, improving negotiating skills, objectives and standards, building planning statistics, budget management, cost-benefit analysis, staff creativity, increased productivity, and automation. The information is designed for the academic library administrator and manager faced with difficult budget choices and less than enough money to do that which needs to be done.

Hughes, Carol. "Opening a Universitywide Dialogue About Electronic Resources." *College & Research Libraries News*, 52 (February, 1991), 84-87.

An increasing number of articles in the professional literature assert that electronic information resources and the technological tools which provide access to them are radically changing scholarly communication. The University of Michigan began a broad based dialogue which they hope will lead to a practical consensus on directions and strategies for the institution.

Jenkins, Clare, and Mary Morley. *Collection Management in Academic Libraries.* (Brookfield, VT: Gower, 1991). 300 p.

Collection management is now a very important and complicated business...a topic of international concern for library managers. Academic libraries worldwide find it more important than ever to define their aims and look to costs and user profiles. The contents of this volume consisting of essays by contributors from all parts of the world are: Performance Indicators and Measurement; Finance and Budgeting; Staffing and Organization; Automated Systems and Services; The Role of Suppliers; Selection, Acquisition and Exploitation of Stock; Management of Particular Types of Material; The National Picture; Summing Up and Conclusions. The editors are British. [Abstracted from Publisher's Announcement]

Lewis, David W . "Inventing the Electronic University. " *College & Research Libraries*, 49 (July, 1988), 291-304.

Higher education is confronting a fundamental change. The transition from print on paper to digital and electronic technologies is transforming instruction, scholarly communication and the storage and preservation of knowledge. What is required is not the automation of old systems, but the restructuring of institutions. The drive for autonomy, needed for effective scholarship, and the push for standardization, needed to assure easy and open access to information, will create conflicts difficult to resolve. Universities must find new ways of funding and financing information services and new staffing patterns if they are to continue as effective learning and research centers. "Electronic communication is not simply a link to colleagues, but a link to resources. It can replace storage, or as a librarian would put it, "access can replace ownership."

Kirk, Thomas and Thomas Michalak. "The Coalition for Networked Information." *College & Research Libraries News*, 51 (September, 1990), 751-753.

The Association of Research Libraries (ARL), CAUSE (the professional association for the management of information technology in higher education), and EDUCOM (a nonprofit consortium of colleges, universities, and other institutions involved with campus information networking) have formed a Coalition for Networked Information to Advance Scholarship and Intellectual Productivity. The Coalition will "promote the provision of information resources on existing networks and on proposed interconnected networks."

Munn, Robert F. "The Bottomless Pit, Or the Academic Library as Viewed from the Administration Building." *College & Research Libraries*, 50 (November, 1989), 635-637.

Library administrators could adjudge their likely fortunes in the academic tug-of-war for funds if they understood more clearly the attitudes of institutional administrators toward libraries. Some view the library as "a bottomless pit"; all recognize that the library is unlikely to generate much political pressure for its own aggrandizement. Many young institutional administrators are coming to apply more sophisticated measures to their funding formulas than have been utilized in the past. Librarians therefore would be well advised to become more proficient in modern management techniques and program budgeting concepts. [Author]

Newcomb-Doty, Yvonne. "Service Vs. Economics." *College & Research Libraries News*, 51 (March, 1990), 211-215.

The budget crisis has forced the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools to emphasize a reexamination of policies regarding availability of the resources of community college libraries for all people on all campuses and centers made possible by centralized access through automated systems. Of primary concern is "the gap between the philosophical commitments of the community colleges and the financial support allocations." Solving the problem of service vs. economics is the dilemma that must be faced by branch and multi-campus library administration in community colleges.

Shaughnessy, Thomas W. "Management Strategies for Financial Crises." *Journal of Library Administration*, 10 (Spring, 1989), 3-15.

This paper provides an administrative perspective on the problems that beset libraries as a result of the financial crisis. The author suggests strategies for responding to management problems caused by the crisis: (l) relations with campus officials; (2) impact on library staff; and (3) impact on library users.

Shaw, Ward, and Patricia Culkin. *Computer-based Library Management Systems*. (Denver, CO: University of Denver, 197?), 52 1.

## SOME COOPERATIVE SOLUTIONS: COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT, RESOURCE SHARING, REDUCING COSTS

Association of Research Libraries. *Cooperative Collection Development*. SPEC Kit No. 111. (Washington, DC: Office of Management Studies, 1985) 103 p.

The sections of this Kit review cooperative collection development activities among ARL member institutions, indicating that many are involved with local, statewide, or regional consortia that develop and operate one or more fairly traditional cooperative programs.

Atkinson, Ross. "Old Forms, New Forms: The Challenge of Collection Development." *College & Research Libraries*, 50 (September, 1989), 507-520.

Collection development is intended primarily to improve the academic library's ability to fulfill competing information responsibilities with chronically inadequate resources. In order to meet this challenge, collection development has sought to create a system out of the processes which are already endemic to selection. If this system is to progress, if it is to adapt to rapidly changing technical and economic conditions, it must have the capacity to exert greater control over scholarly and educational information. Steps toward this increased control should include the categorization of sources and access by function rather than merely by subject, the ongoing definition of a title-specific core, and the development of prescriptive access and collection policies.

Ballard, Thomas H. "Dogma Clouds the Facts." *American Libraries*, 16 (April, 1985), 257-259.

The author examines arguments now being presented in support of public library networking and resource sharing and suggests ways to obtain harder evidence that might serve to legitimize these beliefs, estimate benefits, build in evaluation, support estimates of benefits, seek cheaper alternatives for accomplishing the same goals, and consider alternatives to cooperation.

_______________. "The Unfulfilled Promise of Resource Sharing." *American Libraries*, 21 (November, 1990), 990-993.

An examination of interlibrary loan practices reveals little progress toward equalized public library service. The increasingly automated environment is much more capable of sharing resources than ever before. Still, ILL departments look at ILL service rather than resource sharing.

Battin, Patricia. "Research Libraries in the Network Environment: The Case for Cooperation." *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 6 (May, 1980), 68-73.

A national cooperative strategy by research libraries is needed in collection development capabilities, technological developments, preservation requirements and the process of scholarly communication. The publications explosion, rapid inflation, and technological advancement have invalidated traditional operating assumptions of research libraries.

Bearman, Toni Carbo, and Ward Shaw, Editors. *The Role of the Information Science Community in a National Network*. [Prepared by the Networking Committee and the Special Interest Group on Library Automation and Networks (SIG/LAN) of the American Society for Information (ASIS)] (New York: The Committee, 1981). 16 p.

Beaupre, Linda. *Cooperative Activities in the University of California Libraries*. (Berkeley, University of California, 1976). 47 p.

A summary of this report may be found in Association of Research Libraries. *Resource Sharing*. SPEC Kit No. 42 (Washington, DC: Office of Management Studies, 1978). The report describes the variety of cooperative activities engaged in by the University of California ranging from bilateral agreements between campuses to national and international programs. In terms of resource sharing, the key factor is immediacy of the user's need for a specific work. To be effective, such cooperation must insure current information about collections, provide access to collections, and maintain complementary collections. The report outlines current programs and activities that provide these elements for the sharing of library collections and services among on-campus and off-campus users.

Branin, Joseph J. "Issues in Cooperative Collection Development: The Promise and Frustration of Resource Sharing." In *Issues in Cooperative*

*Collection Development*, Edited by June L. Engle and Sue O. Medina. (Atlanta, GA: Southeastern Library Network, 1986), 1-38.

The author, Associate Director for Collection at the University of Georgia, delivered the keynote speech at the SOLINET Resource Sharing and Networks Support Program described below (See Engle, June L.). He reviews historical efforts in coordinated collection development, obstacles encountered in planning such activities today, and strategies for overcoming the identified obstacles. His presentation includes informative examples of current efforts such as the RLG Conspectus, the North American Inventory of Collections project, and the National Shelf List Count. The discussion section following the speech is included.

Buzzard, Marion L. "Cooperative Acquisitions Within A System: The University of California Shared Purchase Program." Resource Sharing and Information Networks, 2 (Spring/Summer, 1985), 99-113.

The Shared Purchase Program was implemented mainly to prevent unnecessary duplication of expensive, low use materials among the nine campuses of the University of California. The program is considered a success by its participants in spite of problems of methodology and access that remain to be resolved.

Downes, Robin. "Resource Sharing and New Information Technology--An Idea Whose Time Has Come." *Journal of Library Administration*, 10 (Spring, 1989), 115-125.

Regardless of how a university administration responds to the budget requests of its library, there is on some campuses a clear understanding between library and administration that university libraries have a life span of no more than fifteen years. The agenda of the budget dialogue between them is really about how much should be spent on maintaining the present configuration of collection and services. Both the library and the administration share basic assumptions on the need, not just to plan for, but to take active steps toward, a presumed hypothetical revolution in how information is produced and distributed. The scenario includes a mix of conventional and electronic publishing and a reliance on new information technology.

Engle, June L., and Sue O. Medina, Editors. *Issues in Cooperative Collection Development*. (Atlanta, GA: Southeastern Library Network, 1986), 82 p.

Librarians in the South have traditionally shared resources as a means of overcoming the region's historical poverty. There is a growing number of programs designed to facilitate resource sharing that involve coordinated collection development in the region. The Southeast Library Network, Inc. (SOLINET) sponsored a program to assist librarians engaged in these endeavors. This volume contains the following papers delivered at the SOLINET Resource Sharing and Networks Support Program on March 11,

1988. Most include the question and answer segments after the speech. (1) Issues in Cooperative Collection Development: the Promise and Frustration of Resource Sharing, by Joseph J. Branin; (2) North Alabama Union List of Serials, by Craig Stillings; (3) Cooperative Collection Development Program in a Multitype Library Environment, by Lee Pike; (4) Cooperative Collection Management on a Statewide Basis, by Sue O. Medina.

Gore, Daniel. "Curbing the Growth of Academic Libraries." *Library Journal*, 106 (November 15, 1981), 183-187.

Academic libraries should consider cooperative storage of unused or little-used library materials to offset the proliferation of print materials and conserve financial resources. Mutually shared storage would retain collection integrity, expand collection availability, conserve library space for the active collection, and permit a no-growth policy for the library facility.

Gregor, Dorothy. *Feasibility of Cooperative Collecting of Exotic Foreign Language Serial Titles Among Health Sciences Libraries in California*. (Berkeley, CA: University of California, Berkeley Institute of Library Research, 1974). 50 p. ERIC Document No. 104 407.

This study concerns the feasibility of developing cooperative arrangements for sharing exotic foreign language serial titles among the health sciences libraries of California. Circulation counts indicated that 74 percent of the 77 titles counted had circulated twice a year or less and that the libraries involved do maintain multiple subscriptions to those titles. Because the National Library of Medicine encourages cooperative programs among health sciences libraries and the libraries studied now have access to an online serials database to aid in the implementation of such arrangements, there exist the incentive and the means to initiate some cooperative arrangements. The study results indicate that exotic foreign language serials might be a useful category with which to begin.

Gwinn, Nancy E., and Paul H. Mosher. "Coordinating Collection Development: The RLG Conspectus." *College & Research Libraries*, 44 (March, 1983), 128-139.

The RLG Conspectus is an overview, arranged by subject, of existing collection strengths and future collecting intensities of RLG members. The article offers a description of the data gathering process and of the online version of the database. The Association of Research Libraries is conducting an experiment to see whether the methodology can be extended to non-RLG Association members.

Harloe, Bart, Editor. *Towards the Year 2001: Cooperative Collective Development and Resource Sharing in the Southwest*. (Proceedings of a Workshop Held in Las Cruces, New Mexico, November 7, 1988). ERIC Document No. ED 309 787.

These proceedings of a workshop on cooperative collection development and resource sharing in the Southwest contains the text of the following presentations: (l) "Collaborative Collection Development in an Era of Financial Limitations" (Paul Mosher); (2) "Cooperative Collection Development: The New Mexico Point of View" (Jeanne Sohn); (3) "Collection Development Policies and the Arizona Experience" (Dora Biblarz); (4) "Technical Aspects of Cooperative Collection Development" (Sara Heitshu); and (5) Trans-Border Cooperation and the Texas Experience" (Mary Keckley). The publication includes the workshop discussions by the presenters and audience members and bibliographical information.

Hewitt, Joe A., and John S. Shapman. "Cooperative Collection Development Among Research Libraries in the Age of Networking: Report of a Survey of ARL Libraries." *Advances in Library Automation and Networking*, 1 (1987), 189-232.

The objectives of this study were to prepare an inventory of cooperative collection development programs among ARL libraries. Some aspects included were purposes of the programs, formal recognition by the university or library administration of the CCD programs, program activities, written policy, funding and priorities, physical access and interlibrary loan, bibliographic access, and problems. The researchers discovered some flaws in the instrument used for the study, but in spite of these flaws, derive some enlightening conclusions. The survey "revealed something of a schism between the levels of aspiration and accomplishment in cooperative collection development." However, this does not lessen the significance of the CCD relationships established during the last 20 years.

Lowry, Charles B. "Resource Sharing or Cost Shifting?--The Unequal Burden of Cooperative Cataloging and ILL in Network." *College & Research Libraries*, 51 (January, 1990), 11-19.

The values and reward system that characterize library cooperation are drawn from an environment quite different from that of the modern library network, which is founded on the shared cataloging/ILL utility. Reflecting as it does on earlier systems of values about participation, the reward system for the technology-based network encourages use of but not contribution to the "national library database." This paper examines the dilemmas of participation in resource sharing networks and proposes solutions based on shifting the inducements toward contribution by remunerating the contributing library for the unit cost of original cataloging and the suggested restructuring. The restructuring suggested applies to library network/utilities in general.

Luquire, Wilson, Editor. "Coordinating Cooperative Collection Development: A National Perspective." *Resource Sharing and Information Networks*, 2 (Spring/Summer, 1985), 1-252.

The papers in this issue provide a series of practical seminars on how libraries have attempted cooperative collection development projects. They are (l) A National Scheme for Collaboration in Collection Development: The RLG-NCIP Effort, by Paul H. Mosher; (2) The North American Collections Inventory Project (NCIP): 1984 Phase II Results in Indiana, by David Farrell; (3) A System Level Coordinated Cooperative Collection Development Model for Illinois, by Karen Krueger; (4) Cooperative Collection Development Among Research Libraries: The Colorado Experience, by Joel Rutstein; (5) Indiana, Colorado, and Illinois-Comments on Three Approaches to Coordinated Cooperative Collection Development (CCCD), by Terry L. Weech. The papers are followed by several discussions of other CCCD programs in various parts of the country.

Maass, Barbara. "The New Mythology: Co-operative Collection Development." *Canadian Library Journal*, 46 (February, 1989), 23-29.

Maass reviews the historical record of cooperative collection development activities and identifies fundamental problems that have hampered these activities. She argues that there is a need to implement a resource network approach which emphasizes short term need and resources as opposed to long range planning.

Medina, Sue 0. "Cooperative Collection Management on a Statewide Basis." In *Issues in Cooperative Collection Development*, Edited by June L. Engle and Sue 0. Medina. (Atlanta, GA: Southeastern Library Network, 1986), 67-79.

The author, Director of the Network of Alabama Academic Libraries, describes plans for the sixteen-member consortium to develop a statewide coordinated collection development program. She discusses planning activities of NAAL such as a required assessment of the ability of an academic library to support a new program proposed for an institution, use of the Amigos Collection Analysis Software to analyze the machine-readable database to generate collection management information, and compilation of a union list of major microform sets to aid in entering analytics for the sets into SOLINET/OCLC.

Poulos, Angela. *Cooperative Collection Development*. [Expansion of a Paper Presented at the Academic Library Association of Ohio, 1978.] ERIC Document No. ED 206 320. 18 p.

Cooperative collection development is a method of coping with rising prices for expensive and little used library materials. Poulos describes the experiences of institutions which have had success in overcoming difficulties associated with cooperative ventures and recommends twelve ways of solving the various problems that arise.

*Resource Sharing & Information Networks*. Volume 7 (Fall, 1991- ). ISSN 1042-4458. Subscription: $18 Individuals; $24 Institutions. The Haworth

Press, 10 Alice Street, Binghamton, NY 13904. Editor: Robert P. Holley, Associate Dean of Libraries, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan.

This quarterly journal focuses on topics appropriate to local, state, regional, national, and international networks, and their associated activities, such as interlibrary loan, cooperative collection development, document delivery including telefacsimile and transborder data flow.

Rutledge, John, and Luke Swindler. "Evaluating Membership in a Resource-Sharing Program: The Center for Research Libraries." *College & Research Libraries*, 49 (September, 1988), 409-424.

The authors examine arguments in favor of membership in the Center for Research Libraries in light of its changing collections and services, the changing environment of cooperative collection development, and the changing needs and fiscal situations of research libraries. They discuss the classic arguments for participation from both theoretical and practical perspectives, using the experience of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and other CRL members as cases in point. They also assess four evaluation methodologies encompassing the major quantifiable benefits of membership.

Shaw, Ward. "Resource Sharing and the Network Approach." *Academic Libraries*, 10 (September, 1982), 55-60.

The major benefit of library automation lies in the potential for sharing infrequently used titles among libraries through local, regional, national, and international networks. These offer administrators a powerful tool for maximizing their institutions' research resources and flexibility.

## INTERLIBRARY LOAN, DOCUMENT DELIVERY: RECENT STRATEGIES, NEW TECHNOLOGIES

Ardis, Susan B., and Karen S. Cronels. "Document Delivery, Cost Containment and Serial Ownership." *College & Research Libraries News*, 48 (November, 1987), 624-627.

Due to today's near-crisis situation in journal prices, added to the ever growing pressure of space constraints and budget uncertainties, the Science librarians at the University of Texas at Austin thought that purchasing articles from commercial document delivery services might be more cost effective than ownership of infrequently used titles. A pilot study was done from February 2 through April 30, 1987 and as anticipated the study confirmed the hypothesis that commercial document delivery of rarely used materials is a cost-effective alternative to ownership .

Bonk, Sharon. "Interlibrary Loan and Document Delivery in the United Kingdom." *RQ*, 30 (Winter, 1990), 230-240.

The United Kingdom has a fundamentally different organization for its interlibrary loan system. Technological advances and political forces are reshaping the structure of the interlending system. Effects of the British Library Document Supply Centre to retain its central role include carefully moderating its price increases to British libraries and increasing its foreign revenues. Discussed are the changing technologies, economic and political dimensions of ILL plus a summary of the structure of ILL in the United Kingdom.

Calabrese, Andrew M., and Stephen R. Acker. *Information System Design: A Case Study in the Generation of Innovations.* Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Communication Association. (37th, Montreal, Quebec, Canada, May 21-25, 1987). 29 p. ERIC Document No. ED 295 222.

Arguing that designing information systems must involve the integration of social/organizational as well as technical activities, and assuming that the contribution of social scientists studying innovation will be enhanced through increased participation in the design process, this paper presents a case study in the generation of innovation. The innovation considered is an electronic document delivery system (EDD) under development in the Office of Research at the Online Computer Library Center (OCLC). It is important to view information systems from a socio-technical perspective as early as possible in the design stage of innovation, since without consideration of the social, an idealized technical design concept may not move forward as a practical social system as it has been conceived. The authors review the literature of action research for its relevant application to the generation of innovation. Data on OCLC was gathered intensively over a period of eighteen months beginning in 1979 and periodically in the years since that time.

Chang, Amy. "Computerizing Communication for Interlibrary Loan." *College & Research Libraries News*, 50 (December, 1989), 992-994.

Electronic mail for faculty and students solved the interlibrary loan crunch at Texas Tech. The staff designed an electronic mail system which allows faculty and students to request materials from their offices and homes via the E-Mail System any time of the day.

Cline, Gloria S. "The High Price of Interlibrary Loan Service." *RQ*, 27 (Fall, 1987), 80-86.

Charges for interlibrary loan service have increased markedly over the past fifteen years, and high prices now constitute a major dilemma for both librarians and users of the service. In addition to high prices, this paper discusses other problems of ILL, e. g., the use of confusing terminology, poor invoicing practices, and the trend toward increased restrictions regarding whom a library will serve. The writer emphasizes the need for standardized fees, terminology, and invoice forms.

Edvalson, Terry. *Online Reference and Document Delivery Service Library Network.* (December, 1988) ERIC Document No. ED 306 926.

The Online Reference and Document Delivery Service Network developed at Eastern Oregon State College and operated in Eastern Oregon provides rural east Oregonians improved access to information sources via computers, telefacsimile, and telecommunications. Microcomputers have been placed in public school, community college, and hospital libraries in the 10-county region served by the college. This Network, proposed by library personnel to solve the problem of lack of library support for students in off-campus college programs, include: comprehensive, current awareness, known-item, and brief topic searches and telefacsimile transmission of documents, improved reference services, cooperative collection development efforts, and electronic mail service.

Eichhorn, Sara. "Books and Bytes." *College & Research Libraries News*, 49 (November, 1988), 658-661.

Eichhorn describes a successful electronic document delivery service for books and journal articles at the University of California at Irvine. The success of this service has encouraged UCI to make plans to accept interlibrary loan requests and course listings for Reserve Services by electronic mail.

"FAX!" [Special Report] *American Libraries*, 19 (January, 1988), 57-64.

Five articles describe projects for document delivery in which FAX was used to overcome old problems. They are: (1) "FAX It To Me: A Library Love Affair," by Mary Y. Moore; (2) "'FAX Is Integral'--To Center's Vast Operations," by Colette Mak; (3) "Libraries Fast-FAX for Physicians," by Anthony Aguirre; (4) A City/County Library Tries Intra-Faxing," by Eve J. Davis; and (5) "Fax Goes Far in Montana, " by Linda Brander.

Halsey, Kathleen F. *An Evaluation of Document Delivery Service to Interlibrary Loan: A Commercial Firm and a Traditional Library Source.* Master's Thesis. Cardinal Stritch College, 1988. 78 p. ERIC Document No. ED 302 261.

This study was conducted at a midwestern university to determine whether a commercial firm can serve as a viable alternative to the conventional library source for academic interlibrary loan document delivery service. 124 identical article requests were ordered electronically and almost simultaneously from both the University Microfilms International (UMI) and Wisconsin Interlibrary Services (WILS). Various types of data were recorded with the following conclusions reached: (1) even at greater expense, the ILL manager may find commercial firms convenient for handling copyright compliance and filling requests unavailable from traditional sources; (2) telefacsimile promises improvement in turnaround time; and (3) although WILS does an excellent job in meeting the university's ILL needs, commercial firms can also be utilized to broaden that kind of service.

Higginbotham, Barbara Buckner. "Telefacsimile: The Issues and the Answers." *Journal of Interlibrary Loan and Information Supply*, 1 (1990), 67-86.

This paper, an adaptation of the Report of the Telefacsimile Task Force of the New York Metropolitan Reference and Research Library Agency (METRO), designed a useful decision-making tool for institutions contemplating the incorporation of telefacsimile that helps to identify the issues surrounding facsimile.

Howard, Ellen H., and Terry Ann Jankowski. "Reference Services via Electronic Mail." *Bulletin of the Medical Library Association*, 74 (January, 1986), 41-44.

The University of Washington Health Sciences Library decided to incorporate the University's electronic mail service with their library service. Since the Health Science Center faculty, researchers, and residents have access to in-house electronic mail, the library experimented with interlibrary loans, online searches, books to be held, and book renewals.

*Journal of Interlibrary Loan and Information Supply*, Volume 1, No. 1 (1990- ISSN 1042-4458. Subscription: $18 Individuals; $24 Institutions. The Haworth Press, 10 Alice Street, Binghamton, NY 13904. Editor: Leslie R. Morris, Director of Libraries, Niagara University Library, Niagara University, New York 14109.

This is the first journal devoted to interlibrary loan problems and the basic expanding roles of interlibrary loan librarians based in North America. Until its publication, there has been no broad-based, practical yet professional periodical that ILL librarians in North America and abroad could specifically rely on for their special needs. Articles focus on the broad spectrum of all library and information center functions that rely heavily on ILL and information supply. In addition, there are practical and research-based articles on ILL. Several features appear in each issue, one being a column entitled "As a Matter of Fax" written by Steven J. Schmidt, Interlibrary Services Librarian at Indiana University.

Kovacs, Gabor J., and Others. "The Effects of Linking Bibliographic Utilities: A Progress Report." *Bulletin of the American Society for Information Science*, 6 (June, 1980), 18-20.

Kovacs summarizes the results of a project which analyzed data for decisions concerning linking; i. e., whether and how to link utilities in order to pool bibliographic resources. He discusses the benefits of links for cataloging, interlibrary loan, and online reference and presents a cost-revenue model which analyzes alternatives for linking.

McCartney, Elizabeth J. "The Impact of Adding Retrospective Conversion Holdings to OCLC on Interlibrary Loan Lending." *RQ*, 28 (Spring, 1989), 327-333 .

Greater access to library collections and better communication have affected interlibrary loan (ILL) during the last fifteen years. At those libraries where retrospective conversion holdings have been added to bibliographic utilities such as OCLC, ILL has increased. This paper examines the experience of one library by determining the change in the number of lending requests received, what part of the change could be attributed to the library's use of OCLC, what proportion of the change could be attributed to the retrospective conversion project, and whether the type of material cataloged influenced the change in the number of requests received. Results indicated that the library's use of OCLC greatly increased the number of requests but that the addition of retrospective conversion items contributed to the increase.

Raitt, David I. "Information Delivery Systems." *Annual Review of Information Science & Technology*. (White Plains, NY: Knowledge Industry Publications for the American Society for Information Science, 1985), 55-90.

This selective survey covers the technical, historical, and social background of information delivery systems in Europe and the United States. Defining the topic as one in which information, in its broadest sense, is delivered electronically via public or private networks to a user's office or home on demand, the author provides an overview of the literature covering the systems (videotex, teletext, cable, satellites); the differences between the systems in the United States and Europe, the technology (decoders, architecture, software); the applications in specific fields (banking, education, shopping); and the issues (regulatory, legal and policy). An extensive bibliography concludes the review.

Reynolds, Dennis J. "Regional Alternatives for Interlibrary Loan; Access to Unreported Holdings." *College & Research Libraries*, 41 (January, 1980), 33-42.

A highly structured inexpensive teletype system used by several libraries in western Illinois has resulted in filling about 50 percent of the members' requests for monographs despite a nearly total lack of knowledge of each other's holdings. Recent experimentation with the OCLC interlibrary loan subsystem shows promise under similar conditions.

Schmidt, Steven J. "As a Matter of Fax." *Journal of Interlibrary Loan and Information Supply*, 1 (1990), 5.

About his feature column in this new journal, Schmidt states "The purpose of this column is to demonstrate the workings of these marvelous machines [FAX]. In this and future editions, we hope to display some of their uses and to point out some of the pros and cons involved in using telefacsimile as a communication and document delivery tool."

Turner, Fay. "Interlibrary Loan Protocol: An International Standard for Electronic ILL Messaging--Part I." *Journal of Interlibrary Loan and Information Supply*, 1 (1990), 109-117.

An Interlibrary Loan Protocol has been developed to facilitate resource sharing in a computerized library environment. The protocol defines a standard which permits the exchange of ILL messages between institutions that use different computers, systems, and communication services. The protocol is currently being standardized by the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) and is being examined for implementation by institutions in North America and Europe.

Wessling, Julie E. "Benefits from Automated ILL Borrowing Records: Use of ILLRKS in an Academic Library." *RQ*, 29 (Winter, 1989), 209-218.

A review of software available for managing ILL statistics resulted in Colorado State University Libraries selecting ILLRKS (Interlibrary Loan Record Keeping System) for control of borrowing files. Colorado State served as the alpha site for modification of ILLRKS to accept RLIN records, allowing RLIN, OCLC, ALA, and E-mail requests to be automatically merged into one file. The program facilitates file management, streamlines statistics, and aids collection development.

## ELECTRONIC PUBLISHING, ONLINE ACCESS TO INFORMATION, THE FUTURE

Bevilacqua, Ann F. "Hypertext: Behind the Hype." *American Libraries*, 20 (February, 1989), 158-162.

The author, a hypertext expert, defines and describes hypertext, discusses the history of this new software tool, its applications and limitations. She deplores the fact that the driving force behind the current hypertext projects...has not been libraries, but scholars. "They are building a hypertext world and we are not yet a part of it." She urges librarians to involve themselves in this new world.

Bingham, Sanford, and Rex Roberts. "Machines of Enlightenment." *Columbia*, (Fall, 1990), 26-31.

Tracing the revolutionary changes wrought by the impact of computer revolution technology that marked the "dawning of the Information Age," the authors describe various communication technologies (Fax, Audiotex, Hypertext, Fiber-optic Cable, Satellites) and the facilitated access to information made possible by library bibliographic networks. But they caution against "threats to freedom inherent in increasing technological sophistication."

Buckland, Michael K. "Library Materials: Paper, Microform, Database." *College & Research Libraries*, 49 (March, 1988), 117-122.

Buckland compares the characteristics of paper or microform library materials, electronic publications, and online databases in terms of equipment needs, cost effectiveness, budgeting, and satisfaction of users' needs, offering several suggestions for effective integration of these materials.

Kibirige, Harry M. "Computer-Assisted Reference Services: What the Computer Will Not Do." *RQ*, 27, (Spring, 1988), 377-383.

Computer-power euphoria is overshadowing most other issues in information services. To many participants, the computer is an information panacea. In the reference department, computerized database searching is regarded by some as the ultimate solution in providing information. This article analyzes computerized reference and information services with respect to communication barriers between the user and the information specialist; local resources development; external services policy; search strategy development; and artificial intelligence. As librarians and other information specialists participate in automation, several vital issues have been superficially considered. An efficient reference service must have effective local resources and a developing interlibrary loan materials pool. Adoption of expert systems in reference work must leave important policy decisions to people.

LaRue, James. "Sending Them a Message: Electronic Bulletin Boards." *Wilson Library Bulletin*, 60 (June, 1986), 30-33.

This article discusses similarities between the local bulletin board system (BBS) and the public library. Highlights include components of the small BBS (system operator, host computer, "messaging" software, auto-answer device, connection to one or more phone lines); uploading and downloading; notes from the board; and the role of the librarian.

Martin, Susan K. "Information Technology and Libraries: Toward the Year 2000." *College & Research Libraries*, 50 (July, 1989), 397-405.

Some current trends will intensify and begin to make major changes in the way that libraries operate and the way that society uses information technologies in the next century. Among the trends are: more focus on user needs, with users accessing electronic information directly; an increasing tendency for information users to bypass the library; the obsolescence of first-and-second-generation systems; a contention between optical products and online access; and a focus in the United States on formulation of major information policies. Inherent in these are both challenges and opportunities for libraries.

Michalak, Thomas. "The Application of Centralized Text Editing and Electronic Mail Systems in Libraries: The CMU Experience." *Library Hi Tech*, 2 (Winter, 1984), 24-30.

Carnegie-Mellon University Libraries utilize three software packages resident on the University's central computers for text editing, text formatting, and electronic mail. The author explains the advantages of utilizing central computing resources, describes the introduction of and training in computing systems within libraries, some specific applications, and notes some advantages and problems of electronic mail.

Morris, Dilys E. "Electronic Information and Technology: Impact and Potential for Academic Libraries." *College & Research Libraries*, 50 (January, 1989), 56-64.

Morris discusses the impact of technology and the economics of information on academic libraries. He calls on libraries to forge a renewed national commitment to cooperate in the building of a national information network for scholarly communications that is based on the existing bibliographic utilities and the developing academic networks.

Porter, G. Margaret. "What Does Electronic Access to Bibliographic Information Cost?" *College & Research Libraries News*, 52 (February, 1991), 90-92.

Porter describes the various products and pricing structures libraries encounter when purchasing CD-ROMs and online catalogs. She concludes with the following caveats: negotiations with vendors and producers are important; information gathered today will be outdated by tomorrow; and finally, it will probably always be more expensive than anticipated.

Roberts, Kenneth H. *The Library in Tomorrow's Society: A Literature Review*. (Paris, France: UNESCO, General Information Programme, 1987). 114 p. ERIC Document No. ED 290 480.

Intended to reflect the international library community's expectations for the next ten to fifteen years and the place of the library in tomorrow's world, this extensive selective review focuses on the professional literature published between 1982 and 1986 which treats the probable evolution of different types of libraries in both developed and developing countries. The following topics are covered: (l) the future information society; (2) the future for librarians-- the search for roles, the influence of technology, professional education and training; (3) the future for libraries of all types; (4) organization and administration of libraries--influence of technological innovations, information system design, policy and planning, interlibrary cooperation, networking, the management of change, the use of marketing methods, fees for service, and manpower issues; (5) library and information work--technological innovations, developing countries, document delivery, social aspects, information communication, online information retrieval; (6) related areas--computer and telecommunications technology, publishing and storage media. The summary chapter notes that the review points to the increasing value placed on information by contemporary society and raises questions of how libraries will meet the demand for access and how the costs of access will be borne.

Roysdon, Christine M., and Laura Lee Elliott. "Electronic Integration of Library Services through a Campuswide Network. " *RQ*, 28 (Fall 1988), 82-93.

In Fall 1986, Lehigh University initiated a campuswide network, creating an integrated electronic workplace for users. Through the capabilities of this network, a broader range of library services is available to the university community. Network reference services include electronic question negotiation, online searching applications, and uploaded bibliographic files. The growth of Lehigh's electronic network demonstrates enhanced efficiency and communication between patrons and librarians. Future plans for expanding reference services on the network will increase the user base and extend Lehigh's abilities as a "wired" university.

Rumsey, Eric. "The Power of the New Microcomputers: Challenge and Opportunity." *College & Research Libraries*, 51 (March, 1990), 95-99.

In the next few years, the power and usability of the microcomputer will increase immensely. Current developments that are contributing to this growth are CD-ROM, the 80386 microprocessor, and the graphic user interface. As the information-handling capability of the computer grows with these new developments, the microcomputer industry will increasingly market information products to end users. As this happens, the library will be challenged to provide users the same ease of access to information that they have on their own computers.

Schuman, Patricia Glass. "Reclaiming Our Technological Future." *Library Journal*, 115 (March 1, 1990), 34-38.

Schuman discusses the future of libraries and librarians focusing on the effects of the information explosion and the application of new technology to provide greater access for users. She considers the information industry, electronic publishing and the role of libraries and stresses the importance of professional librarians in determining developments in library services.

Tinsley, G. Lynn. "An Electronic Bulletin Board: LIBRARY". *Special Libraries*, 80 (Summer, 1989), 188-192.

The article describes an electronic bulletin board called LIBRARY that was developed at Carnegie Mellon University to display the tables of contents of scholarly journals and timely postings of new monographs in the fields of computer science and robotics. It describes the preparation involved in beginning the service, the management and upkeep,the feedback generated from users, and projects future directions.

Woodworth, Anne. "Emerging Electronic Library Services." *Academic Computing*, 4 (February, 1990), 26-28, 50.

Woodworth's discussion of electronic library services and information and resource sharing highlights cooperative ventures between Carnegie Mellon University, the University of Pittsburgh, and the Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh. She describes computer networks, discusses online catalogs and explains the differences between hardware and software, concluding with suggestions for future developments.

## A NEW ELECTRONIC SERIAL

*E Journal: An Electronic Journal Concerned with the Implications of Electronic Documents and Networks.* (Albany, NY: SUNY at Albany) Volume 1, No. 1 [Forthcoming]

*E Journal* is an all-electronic, Bitnet/Internet distributed, peer-reviewed, academic periodical. The editors, Ted Jennings and Ron Bangel, state: We are particularly interested in theory and praxis surrounding the creation, transmission, storage, interpretation, alteration and replication of electronic text. We are also interested in the broader social, psychological, literary, economic and pedagogical implications of computer-mediated networks. Texts that address virtually any subject across this broad spectrum will be given thoughtful consideration.

Members of the electronic-network community and others interested in it make up a large portion of our audience. Therefore, we would be interested (for example) in essays about whether or not anyone should own a communication that has been shared electronically, about the pragmatics of cataloguing and indexing electronic publications, about net-based collaborative learning, about artful uses of hypertext, about the challenges that distance learning may offer to residential campuses, about the role of The Matrix in cultural history and Utopian polemic, about digitally recorded aleatoric fiction, about the systems....and so forth.

The journal's essays will be available free to Bitnet/Internet addresses. Recipients may make paper copies; *E Journal* will provide authenticated paper copy from our read-only archive for use by academic deans or other supervisors. Individual essays, reviews, stories--texts--sent to us will be disseminated to subscribers as soon as they have been through the editorial process, which will also be "paperless." We expect to offer access through libraries to our electronic Contents, Abstracts, and Keywords, and to be indexed and abstracted in appropriate places.

*E Journal* is now soliciting essays for possible publication. We will be happy to consider reviews, letters, and (eventually) annotations that ought to accompany texts we have already published. We would be happy to add interested specialists and generalists to our panel of consulting editors. Please send essays for review and inquiries, to

ejournal@albnyvms.bitnet
ejournal@rachel.albany.edu

Ted Jennings, Editor, OR Ron Bangel, Managing Editor (Acting)
Department of English
University at Albany
State University of New York
Albany, New York

## LIBRARY-ORIENTED ELECTRONIC SERIALS

*IRLIST Digest* (Information Retrieval)
Send the following message to LISTSERV@UCCVMA:
SUBSCRIBE IR-L First Name Last Name

*Newsletter on Serials Pricing Issues*
Send the following message to LISTSERV@UNCVX1:
SUBSCRIBE PRICES-L First Name Last Name

*Public-Access Computer Systems News*
Sent automatically to PACS-L subscribers.
Send the following message to LISTSERV@UHUPVM1:
SUBSCRIBE PACS-L Jane Doe
For a list of back issue files, send the following command
to LISTSERV@UHUPVM1: INDEX PACS-L

*Public-Access Computer Systems Review*
Sent automatically to PACS-L subscribers. See above.
For a list of article files, send the following
command to LISTSERV@UHUPVM1: INDEX PACS-L

## LIBRARY-ORIENTED COMPUTER CONFERENCES

| | |
|---|---|
| ADVANC-L@UDBSU | Geac Advance Library System |
| ARLIS-L@UKCC | Art Libraries Association of North America |
| ATLAS-L@TCUBVM | Data Research ATLAS Users |
| AUTOCAT@UVMVM | Library Cataloging and Authorities Discussion Group |
| BI-L@BINGVMB | Bibliographic Instruction |
| BRS-L@USCVM | BRS/Search Users |
| BUSLIB-L@IDBSU | Business Librarians |
| CWIS-L@WUVMD | Campus-Wide Information Systems |
| ELLASBIB@GREARN | Library Automation in Greece |
| GOVDOC-L@PSUVM | Government Documents |
| ILL-L@UVMVM | Interlibrary Loan |

| | |
|---|---|
| INNOPAC@MAINE | Innovative Interface Users |
| LIBADMIN@UMAB | Library Administration and Management |
| LIBPLN-L@QUCDN | Library Planning |
| LIBREF@KENTVM | Discussion of Library Reference Issues |
| MAPS-L@UGA | Maps and Air Photo Forum |
| MEDLIB-L@UBVM | Medical and Health Sciences Libraries |
| MLA-L@UBVM | Music Library Association |
| NOTIS-L@TCSVM | NOTIS Users |
| NOTMUS-L@UBVM | Notis Music Library List |
| NOTRBCAT@INDYCMS | Notis and Other Rare Book Catalogers |
| PACS-L@UHUPVM1 | Public-Access Computer Systems Forum |
| SERIALSST@UVMVM | Serials Users Discussion Group |
| SPILIB-L@SUVM | SPIRES Users |
| Z3950IW@NERVM | Z39.50 Implementors Workshop |

To subscribe, send the e-mail message:

SUBSCRIBE List First Name Last Name
to **LISTSERVE@NODE,** where the node is the part of the address after the "@."